

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the life and the light of the world, the inspiration of good deeds and honest endeavors, guide us that we may not fail to be the true sons of the living God. Use us that we may be fit examples and upright leaders in every situation and under all circumstances. We pray that those inspirational influences which breathe forth from Thy holy bosom may not only touch us but be hastened until the army of the Lord shall have raised the brotherhood of common love. O throne of mystery, where have been clouds and darkness, let the glory of Thy presence break through; cause to be sent forth voices of righteousness and good will and of triumph in all our land. Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 190. An act granting authority to the Secretary of War to license the use of a certain parcel of land situated in Fort Brady Reservation to Ira D. MacLachlan Post, No. 3, the American Legion, for 15 years;

H. R. 1997. An act to amend Public Law No. 425, Seventy-second Congress, providing for the selection of certain lands in the State of California for the use of the California State park system, approved March 3, 1933;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Charles G. Johnson, State treasurer of the State of California;

H. R. 2501. An act for the relief of Mrs. G. A. Brannan;

H. R. 2737. An act extending and continuing to January 12, 1938, the provisions of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to determine and confirm by patent in the nature of a deed of quitclaim the title to lots in the city of Pensacola, Fla.", approved January 12, 1925;

H. R. 3914. An act for the relief of Oscar Gustaf Bergstrom;

H. R. 5722. An act to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Colonial National Monument in the State of Virginia;

H. R. 7025. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to furnish transportation to persons in the service of the United States in the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7825. An act for the relief of Michael Stodolnik;

H. R. 7930. An act to eliminate certain lands from the Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho;

H. R. 8039. An act for the relief of John B. Meisinger and Nannie B. Meisinger;

H. R. 8074. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1925, relating to Fort McHenry;

H. R. 8278. An act for the relief of Earl Elmer Gallatin;

H. R. 8312. An act to add certain lands to the Rogue River National Forest in the State of Oregon;

H. R. 8495. An act to amend certain plant-quarantine laws;

H. R. 8884. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ollie Myers;

H. R. 9009. An act to make lands in drainage, irrigation, and conservancy districts eligible for loans by the Federal land banks and other Federal agencies loaning on farm lands, notwithstanding the existence of prior liens of assessment made by such districts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9170. An act for the relief of Montie Hermanson;

H. R. 9991. An act to extend the time for applying for and receiving benefits under the act entitled "An act to provide means by which certain Filipinos can emigrate from the United States", approved July 10, 1935;

H. R. 10174. An act for the relief of Ezra Curtis;

H. R. 10785. An act for the relief of John B. H. Waring;

H. R. 10849. An act to authorize an appropriation for improvement of ammunition-storage facilities at Aliamanu, Territory of Hawaii, and Edgewood Arsenal, Md.;

H. R. 11006. An act providing for the examination of the Neuces River and its tributaries, in the State of Texas, for flood-control purposes;

H. R. 11052. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Purrington;

H. R. 11164. An act for the relief of Arthur Van Gestel, alias Arthur Goodsell;

H. R. 11616. An act to fix the compensation of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

H. R. 11768. An act authorizing construction, operation, and maintenance of Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriation for that purpose;

H. R. 11792. An act declaring Bayou St. John, in the city of New Orleans, La., a nonnavigable stream;

H. R. 11821. An act to correct an error in section 16 (e) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, with respect to adjustments in taxes on stocks on hand, in the case of a reduction in processing tax;

H. R. 11929. An act granting to the State of Iowa for State park purposes certain land of the United States in Clayton County, Iowa;

H. R. 11969. An act to promote national defense by organizing the Air Reserve Training Corps;

H. R. 12370. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of Big Blue River and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. J. Res. 377. Joint resolution to enable the States of Maine, New Hampshire, New York, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, and Ohio to conserve and regulate the flow of and purify the waters of rivers and streams whose drainage basins lie within two or more of the said States;

H. J. Res. 465. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of July 18, 1935, relating to the Seventieth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in the District of Columbia in September 1936;

H. J. Res. 497. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Petroleum Exposition, Tulsa, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 499. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend to the Government of Sweden and individuals an invitation to join the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the first permanent settlement in the Delaware River Valley, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 570. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Distinguished Service Medal to Maj. Gen. Clarence Ransom Edwards.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12624. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HALE, and Mr. KEYES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1392. An act to extend the provisions of certain laws to the island of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 4688. An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5368. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chalmette National Monument in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5730. An act to amend section 3 (b) of an act entitled "An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy with respect to the categories of vessels limited by the treaties signed at Washington, February 6, 1922, and at London, April 22, 1930, at the limits prescribed by those treaties; to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels; and for other purposes", approved March 27, 1934;

H. R. 5867. An act for the relief of E. C. Willis, father of the late Charles R. Willis, a minor;

H. R. 7690. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Albany, N. Y.;

H. R. 8234. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Elgin, Ill., and the erection of a heroic Pioneer Memorial;

H. R. 8597. An act to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea"; to maintain discipline on shipboard; and for other purposes;

H. R. 9183. An act to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the Hot Springs National Park in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9485. An act to convey certain lands to Clackamas County, Oreg., for public-park purposes;

H. R. 9654. An act to authorize the purchase by the city of Scappoose, Oreg., of a certain tract of public land revested in the United States under the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218);

H. R. 10101. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1935, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11140. An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by further increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States;

H. R. 11533. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg;

H. R. 11791. An act to make available for national-park purposes certain lands within the area of the proposed Mammoth Cave National Park, Ky.;

H. R. 11915. An act to amend the Coastwise Load Line Act, 1935;

H. R. 11920. An act to increase the efficiency of the Air Corps;

H. R. 12168. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Antietam; and

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to J. Harold Arnold.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 565. An act for the relief of James L. Barnett;

S. 1636. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1769. An act for the relief of Percy C. Wright;

S. 1815. An act to require certain documents of vessels not wholly owned by citizens of the United States and navigated in the territorial waters of the United States, its Territories, or its possessions, to regulate vessels engaged in the fisheries, and for other purposes;

S. 2550. An act to incorporate the American National Institute (Prix de Paris) at Paris, France;

S. 3041. An act to authorize the appointment of John Easter Harris as a major, Corps of Engineers, Regular Army;

S. 3143. An act for the relief of the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners;

S. 3238. An act to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees of contractors on public buildings and public works;

S. 3373. An act to credit the tribal funds of the Indians of the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation in Montana with certain sums expended therefrom for the purchase and maintenance of a tribal herd, and for the purchase of horses destroyed during a dourine epidemic;

S. 3627. An act for the relief of Francis Gerrity;

S. 3700. An act for the relief of the State of Massachusetts;

S. 3723. An act granting an annuity to Theresa E. Thoreson;

S. 3733. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent to certain lands in the State of Montana to Florence Kerr Facey;

S. 3736. An act authorizing and directing the appointment of Joseph W. Harrison as a captain in the Chaplain Reserve Corps;

S. 3822. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies", approved July 2, 1890;

S. 3866. An act to further extend the period of time during which final proof may be offered by homestead and desert land entrymen;

S. 3869. An act to authorize payment of the amounts due on delinquent homestead entries on certain Indian reservations;

S. 4037. An act to amend the act relating to the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, approved June 10, 1930, and for other purposes;

S. 4094. An act to provide for the transfer from the Treasury Department to the Navy Department of the property in Bremerton, Wash., known as the Navy Yard Hotel site;

S. 4152. An act validating certain conveyances by Kickapoo Indians of Oklahoma made prior to February 17, 1933, providing for actions in partition in certain cases;

S. 4289. An act to correct the military records of DeRosey C. Cabell, McFarland Cockrill, James N. Caperton, Junius H. Houghton, Otto F. Lange, Paul B. Parker, James deB. Walbach, and Victor W. B. Wales;

S. 4293. An act for the relief of George W. Middleton;

S. 4341. An act to give precedence to certain proceedings to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes;

S. 4352. An act to provide for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma at Clinton, Okla.;

S. 4393. An act to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Snoqualmie National Forest, in the State of Washington.

S. 4464. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in celebration of the opening of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge;

S. 4483. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of Harvard University;

S. 4488. An act authorizing the Chesapeake Bay Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Chesapeake Bay from a point in Baltimore County, Md., over Hart Island and Miller's Island to a point near Tolchester, Kent County, Md.;

S. 4491. An act for the relief of Arthur Lee Dasher;

S. 4519. An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments, and for other purposes;

S. 4520. An act to amend the act approved June 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 436-439), entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges";

S. 4528. An act to regulate the conduct of elections in Puerto Rico;

S. 4530. An act to reenact section 259 of the Judicial Code, relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses of circuit, district, and customs judges;

S. 4538. An act providing for an examination and survey for a deep-water channel from New Iberia, parish of Iberia, La., to the Gulf of Mexico;

S. 4546. An act to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 4565. An act to authorize the sale, under provisions of the act of March 12, 1926 (Public, No. 45), of surplus War Department real property;

S. 4567. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew for the term of 10 years a lease to the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 9, 1926;

S. 4581. An act authorizing the payment of certain salaries and expenses of employees of the General Land Office;

S. 4596. An act to amend section 21 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934;

S. 4608. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of York County, Maine;

S. 4616. An act for the relief of G. A. Trotter;

S. 4619. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934, for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property through the use of wire and radio communications, and for other purposes;

S. 4625. An act for the relief of Vincent Ford;

S. 4632. An act providing for a preliminary examination of the Colorado River, Tex., above the county line between Coke and Runnels Counties;

S. 4643. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lend certain Army equipment to the diamond jubilee committee, Yankton, S. Dak., for the accommodation of persons attending the celebration to be held by such committee during June 1936;

S. 4648. An act to promote safety at sea in the neighborhood of ice and derelicts, and for other purposes;

S. 4652. An act to provide for the administration of the United States Soldiers' Home;

S. 4656. An act to amend the statutes providing punishment for transmitting threatening communications;

S. 4658. An act to aid the several States in making certain toll bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways free bridges; and for other purposes;

S. 4659. An act to authorize the payment of an annuity to William H. Moran, Chief of the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department, upon his retirement, in recognition and appreciation of his services to the United States;

S. 4667. An act to prohibit the commercial use of the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation pursuant to the obligation of the Government of the United States under article 28 of the Red Cross Convention signed at Geneva July 27, 1929;

S. 4671. An act to amend the act approved February 1, 1928, concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under exclusive jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 4699. An act to provide a commissioned strength for the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for the efficient performance of military and other statutory duties assigned to that corps;

S. 4707. An act for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in Harding town site, Florida, and for the relief of the heirs of Lewis G. Norton;

S. 4709. An act authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Delaware River between points in the village of Barryville, Sullivan County, N. Y., and the village of Shohola, Pike County, Pa.;

S. 4710. An act authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the West Branch of the Delaware River between a point in the vicinity of the village of Hancock, Delaware County, N. Y., and a point in the town of Buckingham, Wayne County, Pa.;

S. 4713. An act validating a town-lot certificate and authorizing and directing issuance of a patent for the same to Ernest F. Brass;

S. 4722. An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution designating the last Sunday in September as "Gold Star Mother's Day", and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1936, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski;

S. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution to provide for the appraisal and purchase of certain articles owned by President and Mrs. George Washington;

S. J. Res. 243. Joint resolution authorizing distribution to the Indians of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in their favor;

S. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution authorizing distribution to the Gros Ventre Indians of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in their favor;

S. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9, 1936, as Leif Ericson Day;

S. J. Res. 267. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the New York World's Fair 1939, Inc., in the city of New York during the year 1939; and

S. J. Res. 270. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a committee to study the question of Puerto Rican independence.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 8455, entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes."

EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9484) to amend section 36 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act for 1933, as amended, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KLEBERG, OWEN, PIERCE, GILCHRIST, and ANDRESEN.

IMPROVEMENTS ON AREAS BETWEEN SHORE AND BULKHEAD LINES IN RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3071) providing for the placing of improvements on the areas between the shore and bulkhead lines in rivers and harbors.

THE AMERICAN AIRSHIP AND THE AMERICAN PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, in the preparation of several articles published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have compiled valuable data which should be printed as a reference for those who may consider the design, construction, and operation of American airships.

When I speak of American airships, I refer to those which shall be designed and constructed by American engineers, upon American engineering principles and not to airships constructed, with Government funds, upon German Zeppelin principles or airships built in Germany.

It is not my thought to censure the great work or the accomplishments of the German Zeppelin organization, which for 30 years have concentrated its efforts upon improving

airship design, construction, and operations. They have demonstrated the fact that large airships are practical and useful, as a means of air transportation. Improvement as the result of their effort cannot decrease the honor of originating the airship and history shall record the distinction due them for their work.

That such distinction is already conceded is shown by the fact the name "Zeppelin" enjoys such present popularity and is so strongly associated with airship construction in the minds of people that, not alone in Germany, it is thought the type of structure employed in the Zeppelin is the only one that will do for an airship.

As to the construction used in the Zeppelin, the criticism is often heard, even in authoritative German quarters, that it is not the most satisfactory solution and that it becomes less so with increase in size of the airship. The structure is an adaptation of the arch-frame bridge and is indeterminate, therefore cannot be calculated upon normal engineering formulas and is "estimated" upon empirical formulas.

In my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 14, 1936, I said:

It is interesting to know that the empirical formulas are established only through experience of actual construction and use of what is classed as an indeterminate structure.

Prior to the construction of the *Akron* and *Macon*, the Zeppelin engineering organization was supplied with data for an airship as large as the *Los Angeles* or the *Graf Zeppelin*. They may have desired to construct an airship the size of the new *Hindenburg*, but perhaps had no data to then warrant such construction. What would they do about it?

It has been stated that when Germany believed it would win the war the German Imperial Command considered who would pay Germany. Their opponents were without resources to pay, and if the United States could be forced into war against Germany then the United States could pay Germany, for the United States was a wealthy Nation. The German Imperial Command, therefore, is said to have deliberately ordered certain naval operations which resulted in the United States becoming involved.

If the German Zeppelin engineers wanted definite information that would warrant them to build the *Hindenburg*, which is larger than the *Akron* or *Macon*, and to advance their empirical formulas with construction and operations data they would need to build larger airships or get someone else to pay for the experiment. My opinion is the United States was again chosen to be "the goat." The construction and destruction of the *Akron* and *Macon* undoubtedly supplied valuable data to the German Zeppelin organization for the construction of the *Hindenburg*.

I do not wish to say anything detrimental to our now-valued American citizens of German birth, who may formerly have been Zeppelin-trained engineers and came to our country to aid in the design and construction of the *Akron*.

The fact remains, however, that these engineers perhaps had not acquired the full technical knowledge then possessed by the Zeppelin organization, or, if they had such knowledge, they did not insist that the *Akron* and *Macon* be constructed with certain important reinforcements which I am informed were employed in the construction of previous Zeppelin airships.

I understand that during the Lighter-Than-Air Forum, at Akron, Ohio, July 25 and 26 last year, the Navy Department was charged with responsibility for the loss of the *Akron* and *Macon* because the builders were not allowed to include certain reinforcements which had been considered necessary and were included in previous Zeppelin-constructed airships.

I do not know if an investigation has been made concerning these charges or the result of such investigation, if made.

The loss of the *Akron* and *Macon* is thought to be directly the result of structural failure at a place which in other Zeppelin airships was reinforced, and the operating personnel of these airships were no more to blame than a driver of a new automobile should be blamed when a front axle breaks and the automobile is wrecked.

We should at least learn from the loss of \$10,000,000 worth of airships, with the lives of scores of men, that we should now question the advice of those who may be responsible for the structure failure of the *Akron* and *Macon* and of those who now recommend the continued construction of such airships, when the United States has the most competent structural engineers in the world, who have been ignored when American airship construction has heretofore been considered.

Extending this thought further, I am informed that when the *Hindenburg* arrived, upon its first trip to the United States, an article was printed in a New York paper stating one of the officials of the Zeppelin organization explained the use of hydrogen gas, when it had been understood the *Hindenburg* would receive helium gas in America, by the fact the difference of 8 pounds lift per thousand cubic feet in the two gases required they build the *Hinden-*

burg lighter, like the *Akron* and *Macon*, or build it stronger and heavier.

The *Hindenburg* employs 7,000,000 cubic feet of hydrogen gas, thus will lift 56,000 pounds more than were helium used. An article in the press stated the payload of the *Hindenburg* was 28,000 pounds. Thus with helium gas there might be no pay load, in fact the airship might be 28,000 pounds heavier than the helium gas would lift.

In my letter of February 10, to Members of Congress, I referred to an article published in the New York Times January 19, 1936, detailing "modifications" in the original *Hindenburg* design. These modifications appeared to be of a character disclosed by the report on the Respass design, issued December 28, 1933. An American design that may comprise features of sufficient value to perhaps modify the Zeppelin design, in the construction of the latest German airship, should be valuable in considering American airship construction.

The fact that the United States has a generous supply of helium gas, while other nations have none, and that this nonexplosive gas increases the safety of airships, both in commercial and military service, should influence the United States to build and operate airships for extending our foreign trade and for the defense of our Nation in the event of war.

In order to use this gas, an airship must be strong to resist stresses and provide safe operations, also be much lighter in weight than appears is possible to be when the Zeppelin construction is employed, as in the *Hindenburg*.

These factors of necessary strength for safety and of light weight to use helium gas for increased safety, must necessarily call for a new type of airship frame, especially in view of the fact that even in authoritative German quarters it is recognized that the Zeppelin adaptation of the arch frame is not the most satisfactory solution and it becomes less so with the increase in size of the airship.

The problem is one to be solved by professional structural engineers, of which America has the best in the world.

The selection of the best materials with consideration of their strength-weight factors, creating a design for using these materials in the most efficient manner, removing the possibility of reversal of stress and fatigue which may secretly affect the strength of materials and reduce the life of a structure, distributing the aerodynamic and static loads to avoid localized stresses, all require the ingenuity and experience of the best qualified professional engineers.

These factors have been studied for several years by eminent American engineers, and an improved design for large airship frames has been prepared for the construction of American airships. This design will meet the above specifications with use of the highest grade steel-wire bridge cables for tension and the best aluminum alloy for compression.

Reversal of stress is not possible in this design and aerodynamic or load stresses are received on elastic steel cables in a manner to absorb the stress by "extension" to adjacent elastic members.

The safety factor of this frame is high; it is light in weight; it will provide a long period of useful service, has relatively few parts, and the cost of its construction is low.

I have been very much impressed by the Vow of Service prepared by Dr. D. B. Steinman, president of the National Society of Professional Engineers, published in the February issue of the American Engineer, as follows:

The engineer—he is the master of the laws of Nature. On a sound foundation of mathematics, science, and economics he bends the materials and forces of Nature to his plan and rears the structure of civilization.

With vision, resourcefulness, and ingenuity, he labors to increase the comfort, wealth, and safety of his fellow men.

He attacks his problems with the vision of the pioneer, the integrity of the scientist, the accuracy of the mathematician, the practicality of the businessman, the resourcefulness of the inventor, and the courage of the conqueror.

He is the planner and builder. He builds his visions into enduring realities.

He is the pathfinder of civilization. He breaks down barriers, bridges chasms, establishes communication, and straightens the way for commerce and human progress.

He is the protagonist of efficiency. He reduces effort, eliminates waste, and increases production.

He is the creator of a nation's wealth. He drains the swamps, reclaims the deserts, develops resources, and harnesses power. He builds the machinery of industry, the wheels of commerce, and the structure of business.

He is the great coordinator. He plans and directs the construction of projects representing the investment of millions of dollars and involving the labor of thousands of men.

He investigates with open mind and gets the facts before he makes decisions. He plans with thoroughness and builds with fidelity.

To his rich heritage from the labors of past generations of engineers and scientists he adds his contributions. He continues the work of forcing outward the challenging barriers that separate man's efforts from the impossible.

Dr. Steinman is an eminent consulting engineer in the design and construction of both arch-frame and suspension bridges and is recognized throughout the world as among the leaders in his profession. He has designed many of the great bridges in North and South America, as well as other sections of the world.

He has knowledge and experience that assures his ability to analyze the Zeppelin arch-bridge type frame, the aerodynamic and load stresses imposed on an airship in flight, and to design an airship structure with the application of the suspension-bridge engineering principles for any size airships.

[Copy of citation in Who's Who in America, 1932-33]

Steinman, David Barnard, bridge engr.; b. N. Y. City, June 11, 1886; s. Louis Kelvin and Eva (Scollard) S.; B. S., summa cum laude, Coll. City of New York, 1906 (3 yrs. fellowship in mechanics); C. E. School of Mines, Columbia, 1909 (2 yrs. scholarship in applied science); A. M. Columbia, 1909; Ph. D., 1910; 1 yr. scholarship in engineering; m. Irene Hoffman, of New York, June 19, 1915; children: John Francis, Alberta, David. Engineering work until 1910; professor of civil engineering, Univ. of Idaho, 1910-14; also consulting practice; special assistant to Gustav Lindenthal on design and construction Hellgate Arch Bridge and other notable bridges, 1914-17. Prof. in charge civil and mech. engrg. College of City of N. Y., 1917-20; cons. practice since 1920.

Designing or cons. engr. many notable bridges, including suspension bridge at Florianopolis, Brazil, largest bridge in S. A., 1922-26; Carquinez Strait Bridge, Calif., longest Cantilever bridge in U. S., 1923-27; Gen. U. S. Grant Bridge over Ohio River at Portsmouth, Ohio, 1926-27; bridge at Grand Mere, Que., largest suspension bridge in Canada, 1928-29; St. Johns Bridge, Portland, Ore., longest and highest span in the West, 1929-31; Sidney Harbor Bridge, Australia, Cologne Muhlheim Bridge over the Rhine, Germany, Sparrows Point Bridge, Baltimore, Md., and many others in five continents. Inventor of new influence line method and charts for design of railway bridges; improvements in suspension bridge design, new system of design loading for railway bridges, simplified methods of analysis for bridge design. Lecturer on bridge design at univs. and engrg. schools. Fellow Aerial League, America, American Geog. Soc. Mem. Am. Soc. C. E., chmn. Structural div., 1931-33; Am. Assn. of Engrs., pres. 1925-26, New York; State Soc. Prof. Engrs., pres., 1930-32; N. Y. State Bd. of Licensing for Prof., Engrs., and Land Surveyors, vice-chmn. 1931-32; national counsel State Bds. of Examin. Engrs., pres. 1931-32. Am. Engrg. Council Com. on Bridge Legislation, 1930-32. Brooklyn Engrs. Club pres. 1931-32. Am. Ry. Engrg. Assn., Am. Soc. for Testing Materials, Am. Concrete Inst., Am. Military Engineers, Soc. for Promotion of Engineering Edn., A. A. A. S., assoc. alumni council city of New York, Engrg. Inst. of Canada, Internat. Assn. Bridge and Structural Engineers, Phi Beta Kappa, etc. Awarded James R. Crowes Medal, 1919. Normal Medal, 1923. Thomas Fitch Roland Prize, 1929. All by the Am. Soc. C. E. Artistic Bridge Award, Am. Inst. Steel Construction, 1930. Prize American Assn. of Engrs., 1926, for "Vow of Service" adopted by engineering profession.

Clubs: Columbia Univ., Millions Club of Sidney, Australia (hon.); author "Suspension Bridges, Their Design, Construction, and Erection", 1923. "Suspension Bridges and Cantilevers, Their Economic Proportions and Limiting Spans", 1911. "Theory of Arches and Suspension Bridges from Melan", 1913; "Concrete Arches, Plain and Reinforced, from Melan", 1917. "Continuous Bridges in Movable and Long Span Steel Bridges", 1923. "Suspension Bridges in Movable and Long Span Steel Bridges", 1923. "Stress Measurements on the Hell Gate Arch Bridge with Appendix on Secondary Stresses in Hell Gate Arch", 1918. "Locomotive Loadings for Railway Bridges", 1922. "Moments in Restrained and Continuous Beams by the Method of Conjugated Points", 1926. "The Eye-Bar Cable Suspension Bridge at Florianopolis, Brazil", 1927. Also numerous articles and papers in engineering journals. Editor, Engrs. Handbook Library, 1921-23. Home: 305 Riverside Drive. Office: 117 Liberty St., New York, N. Y.

I am informed that Dr. Steinman was consultant on the construction of the George Washington Bridge crossing the Hudson River at New York, is consultant on the design of the Tri-Borough Bridge now under construction at New York, is

consultant on the construction of the Golden Gate Bridge at San Francisco, as well as for several other large American bridges completed during the past few years.

One of our American inventors developed the idea of employing the self-anchored suspension bridge principle in the construction of airships. With the cooperation and advice of the Guggenheim School of Aeronautics of New York University, following standard procedure, a scale model was made and tested with very satisfactory results. Robinson & Steinman, consulting engineers, were then employed to design a suspension-bridge frame for an airship, to be constructed upon specifications prepared by the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy Department, for the *Akron* and *Macon*.

Upon the completion of this work Messrs. Robinson & Steinman submitted a report in which were the following statements:

Whatever may be said of the performance of the Zeppelin airship will apply equally to the Respass airship, but the Respass airship would have in addition the following advantages:

- Greater strength and safety.
- Greater inherent strength.
- Increased length of life.
- Decreased maintenance costs.
- More efficient use of material.
- Reduction in cost of construction.
- Reduction in time of construction.
- Ease of construction.
- Simplicity, accuracy, and definiteness of calculation.

The stresses in this airship never reverse, thereby removing all fear of failure in the hull through fatigue and crystallization.

The net pay load will be unusually high, facilitating economical commercial operation.

It should be explained that the design referred to was for an airship 147 feet in diameter by 785 feet long. In view of the fact the frame was the chief consideration, Robinson & Steinman was supplied with complete plans prepared by British airship engineers with the cooperation of an eminent American consulting engineer, which plans were made for submitting a bid for the construction of the two naval airships, later named the *Akron* and the *Macon*, but owing to a technicality the bid was not considered in awarding the contract.

It should be noted Robinson & Steinman not only had knowledge of the construction of the Zeppelin-frame airships but were also fully advised on the details of British airship construction. Thus their conclusions of "greater strength and safety" with other enumerated advantages was for the American design as against the best production of other nations which had designed, constructed, and successfully operated large airships.

We do not, however, have to accept the judgment of only one organization of eminent American engineers. During the present session of Congress I have received letters from engineering societies and professional engineers from nearly all States endorsing the structural principles of the American design, endorsing the report and conclusions of Robinson & Steinman, or deploring the fact our Government has neglected the American engineers who are competent to design and construct American airships.

Connecticut Society of Professional Engineers—Respass Airship, May 30, 1936

At a joint meeting last night of the executive board of the Connecticut Society of Professional Engineers with the legislative committee of the society, a detailed report was received from the subcommittee that was appointed at the last meeting of the board of directors to study the relative values of the American designed suspension-bridge-frame airship and the conventional type airship designs. At the committee's request, designs, data, computations and structural details, with a report from Robinson and Steinman, bridge engineers, on the Respass airship was submitted to it. After 2 weeks of independent study, the committee members joined unanimously in their report which was substantially as follows:

The Respass airship design of suspension-bridge type has structural merit over the conventional type of airship because of these evident advantages:

1. Inherently greater strength with less material.
2. Lower cost of building per cubic foot.

3. Greater factor of safety in storms, at anchor, and in maneuvering.

4. Greater pay load.

5. Bow and stern of greater strength.

Representatives from practically all branches of professional engineering, aeronautical, Diesel, structural, electric, mechanical, power plant, civil, metallurgical, were involved in the study, report, and recommendations.

I stand on record as endorsing the American professional engineer as one class of our citizens who merit real consideration in periods of depression and in matters so closely akin to national defense as is the American airship. After all, it is from their initiative and development in new fields of science that employment eventually emanates.

Government appropriations or loans could well be directed into channels that would increase their employment, as in American airship design and construction or other new types of industries, for which no provision for Government aid, in financing, has been made. Failing action by the present Congress, relief funds could be directed into these channels as loans for providing immediate employment and to be repaid over a period of years to the Treasury general funds.

A notable endorsement of the American engineer, for constructing American airships, comes from Dr. Theodor Von Karman, a former leading German lighter-than-aircraft authority, now an American citizen, who is recognized as being a valuable aid in American heavier-than-aircraft development, through his outstanding ability in stress analysis. The Oakland (Calif.) Tribune published the following:

EXPERT URGES UNITED STATES TO PUSH ON WITH DIRIGIBLES—AMERICA SHOULD NOT LEAVE THIS CONSTRUCTION TO GERMANS, SAYS VON KARMAN

PASADENA, March 15.—America should not "leave dirigible construction to the Germans", in the opinion of Dr. Theodor Von Karman, member of the "scientific jury" appointed to decide this country's airship future, and himself a former leading German lighter-than-aircraft authority.

Dr. Von Karman, director of the Guggenheim Graduate School of Aeronautics of the California Institute of Technology, urged that the United States push ahead in commercial airship construction for, he said, trans-Atlantic air service will be accomplished only by dirigibles.

Reticent regarding the course the Navy should take, in the light of the *Macon* and *Akron* disasters, he said: "It appears to me that possibly the technical problems should be cleared up before dirigibles are made a part of routine military work."

Dr. Von Karman, who was director of the German Aeronautical Institute at Aachen before coming to the United States, praised American aircraft builders' skill and said American ships had been subjected to unfair comparisons with German aircraft.

"It is not quite fair", he said, "to compare the Navy's record of three military airship disasters with the successful record of the *Graf Zeppelin*, a commercial transport. Military aircraft present greater problems, both because of their construction and the use." He pointed out that Germany lost more than 50 zeppelins during the World War through enemy bullets and disasters such as those that overtook the *Macon* and *Akron*.

Airplanes will be used for transoceanic-mail service, but not extensively for passengers and freight, Dr. Von Karman predicted.

Opposed to the employment of the American engineer in American design and construction, we have the "Zeppelin" name, coupled with a most efficient organization, that may have been influential in discouraging the consideration of any United States dirigible construction upon American design. This influence is still endeavoring to have us buy airships built in Germany or to build airships of German design in the United States. I may best illustrate this fact by referring to my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 14, 1936, as follows:

It is not my purpose to make any statement that may reflect on the German engineers who constructed the *Hindenburg* or of those in charge of the airship during its successful flight, but as an American citizen and Member of Congress, I feel it my duty to comment on certain statements published in the press.

The Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., May 10, states:

Eckener reveals purpose of trips. United States financial backing is sought. Dr. Hugo Eckener, commodore of the Zeppelin fleet, said in an interview tonight the primary purpose of the *Hindenburg's* cruises to the United States this year was to win financial backing for a German-American trans-Atlantic transport service.

Such an arrangement between the two countries was planned in 1928, he pointed out, but was frustrated by the depression.

Loss of the Navy dirigibles *Macon* and *Akron* has since soured the American public against dirigibles, he said, and lighter-than-air enthusiasts hope to remove that feeling by week-to-week demonstrations of the *Hindenburg's* capabilities.

It is of interest to know where this financial backing is expected to come from. I have a letter signed by a vice president of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., dated April 28, 1936, stating the following:

We are interested in the subject of airships but are not presently considering the erection of a ship. This has to go through the process of authorization by Congress.

The Washington Herald, Sunday, May 10, states:

United States dirigible sought to match *Hindenburg*. Naval experts' hopes rise as officials prepare to greet Eckener. Successful trans-Atlantic flight of the German Zeppelin *Hindenburg* yesterday buoyed hopes of naval and congressional lighter-than-air enthusiasts that the Federal Government would sponsor constructing a twin ship, perhaps to complement the German air liner's North Atlantic schedule.

Senator BULKLEY, Democrat, of Ohio, has introduced a bill authorizing Federal construction of such a ship.

Navy experts have already planned for construction of a giant sky cruiser exceeding the *Hindenburg* dimensions, to replace the U. S. S. *Akron*, lost at sea 2 years ago.

The Navy's scientific advisory committee, following investigation of the *Akron* and *Macon* disasters, in a preliminary report has recommended continuance of the Navy policy of developing the science of lighter-than-air flights and has urged construction of a new superdirigible. The ship would be operated experimentally apart from the fleet.

The Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation, at Akron, Ohio, staffed with German Zeppelin engineers, has assured the Navy such a ship could be built for about \$3,000,000.

The Navy high command maintains such a dirigible would be the equivalent of a \$10,000,000 light cruiser in fleet scouting, her higher speed compensating for her greater vulnerability.

The Navy plans call for "belly hangers", housing up to 10 airplanes. Planes would be launched and retrieved by a patented trapeze. An observer could watch an enemy fleet operations from a "subcloud car" suspended from a thousand-foot cable while the dirigible remained hidden from detection above the clouds.

The statement that "Navy experts already have planned for construction of a giant sky cruiser, exceeding the *Hindenburg* dimensions, to replace the U. S. S. *Akron*, lost at sea 2 years ago", again recalls my remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 14, 1936, in which I said I believed the United States was once more chosen to be "the goat."

In reference to the paragraph "the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation of Akron, Ohio, staffed with German Zeppelin engineers, has assured the Navy such a ship could be built for about \$3,000,000." I am wondering if a Zeppelin-type airship or the American suspension-bridge frame airship is referred to.

On October 29, 1934, the Honorable Ewing Y. Mitchell, then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, presented to the Federal Aviation Commission an airship-construction program endorsed by the Department of Commerce, and which Mr. Mitchell stated was prepared by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. This program called for the construction of two Goodyear-Zeppelin airships, of 7,000,000 cubic feet capacity, which is the size of the *Hindenburg*, the first costing \$6,500,000 and the second costing \$4,250,000.

Now, according to press reports, the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation has assured the Navy a much larger airship "could be built for about \$3,000,000." It seems that the past 20 months have reduced the cost of American airship construction very materially.

The demonstration made by the *Hindenburg* is worthy in that it shows the capabilities of large airships in transoceanic commercial service. If American engineers duplicated the *Hindenburg*, except in its frame, what could prevent such airship performing as well as the *Hindenburg*?

If the American airship frame was stronger, the airship would be safer; if American nonexplosive helium gas were used, instead of explosive hydrogen gas, the American airship would be much safer; if the American frame were of less weight, a more profitable pay load could be carried; and were the total engine power increased, the American airship would be faster.

I have introduced the bill, H. R. 12682, May 12, 1936, authorizing the construction and operation of two American

trans-Atlantic airships, through a loan by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The effect of this bill is that Congress provides means for an organization of American engineers and business executives to solve the American airship problem, and to design, construct, equip, and operate American airships in overseas commercial service. This bill is as follows:

That for the purpose of fostering the American airship industry and to promote American overseas trade with use of commercial airships, to be available in time of war, to encourage American design, construction, and operation of airships, to demonstrate the value and profit of overseas airship service thus to promote its extension with private capital, and to provide immediate employment in American airship construction, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to lend the sum of \$12,000,000 to the Respass Aeronautical Engineering Corporation for the purposes of constructing an American airship plant, an Atlantic operating terminal, and two airships employing the self-anchored suspension-bridge type frame, each airship having not less than 7,000,000 cubic feet of helium-gas capacity, and for operating such airships in commercial service between the United States and England or other European countries.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall investigate the personnel and engineering organization of the Respass Aeronautical Engineering Corporation and he may require such changes in the present organization as he shall deem to be advisable before such loan is made, and he shall require that full insurance be carried to cover replacement in event of fire, damage, or loss of the airships or other property purchased or constructed with the proceeds of the loan until the full amount is repaid.

SEC. 3. Such loans shall carry interest charges at the rate of 3½ percent per annum, which shall cumulate for a 2-year period, and shall remain a lien on the patents, the patent rights, and all present and subsequently acquired assets of the corporation until paid. The loan, plus accumulated interest, shall be paid in 10 annual payments, the first payment to be made 3 years after the date of the enactment of this act, and any payments on account of the loan shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to be credited to miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$12,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

This bill is for the purpose of providing a loan through which the development and operations of airships will be delegated by Congress to American engineers. It is a business proposition in which the Government extends its aid in forwarding an activity that is of extraordinary value to our Nation, an activity that has already been delayed too long.

The loan may provide the following:

1. Approximately 80 percent of the loan may be used in direct and indirect employment of labor.

2. It may give employment to great numbers of engineers and highly skilled men for whom it is now difficult to provide work in their respective lines.

3. It may construct two great airports, one being in the South and one on the Atlantic seaboard. These airports should be of great military value in event of war.

4. Within 2 weeks after the money is made available for this work several hundred men may be employed, and within a few months approximately 2,000 men may be employed in direct labor, with perhaps several thousand employed in indirect labor.

5. Many types of established industries would be benefited through orders placed for this activity. Approximately 25 percent of the loan may be expended for orders placed with major industries.

6. It may be the start of a great, new American industry and be the first step toward establishing a major form of overseas transportation through which our commerce with foreign nations may be expedited and increased.

7. With the evidence of Government support, as demonstrated by this loan, it is proposed within the year to arrange private financing for the continued construction of airships.

8. It is proposed, through the employment of three and in some cases four shifts of workers, the construction program may be completed in a period of about 12 months.

9. After a thorough test of the airships it is expected trans-Atlantic service may be established, with each airship making a round trip weekly between our Atlantic coast and England. If the loan is approved by this Congress, these airships may be in regular service before the fall of 1937.

10. Such service may expedite our mails and commerce to other nations of the world, to Europe, and to countries which are now best served by transportation from England or European countries.

11. It may in time establish the United States in a dominating commercial position, through fast and economical transportation direct to overseas commercial centers, including those within the interior of continents where rapid transportation is now unknown.

12. It may provide twice-a-week transportation across the Atlantic in less than 40 hours, which, with later improvement, may be reduced to 30 hours.

13. This may be America's answer in the race for faster ocean vessels, that in other countries are built with large Government-construction loans and are supported by annual operating subsidies of considerable size.

14. It will demonstrate to American inventive genius and skilled engineers the confidence of our Government in their ability to design and construct American airships. It will also demonstrate the superiority of American design and construction of airships.

In view of the fact the borrower must depend upon commercial operations for its profit, the construction would be at the lowest cost and of the best quality. No profit may be added nor any royalty be paid under the patents.

Considering the conditions for this loan, we should also consider estimates submitted on October 29, 1934, by the Honorable Ewing Y. Mitchell to the Federal Aviation Commission in the airship-construction program endorsed by the Department of Commerce. The two Goodyear-Zeppelin airships would cost \$10,750,000 and an Atlantic operating terminal to cost \$3,000,000, making a total of \$13,750,000.

With the loan of only \$12,000,000 the Government would have for security two better, stronger, and safer airships of approximately the same size or larger than the Goodyear-Zeppelins, and an Atlantic operating terminal; also an airship construction plant costing approximately \$4,000,000, making a total of \$17,500,000, with the valuation based on the cost of two airships and a commercial airship terminal, being \$13,750,000 in the Department of Commerce proposal. Further, \$1,000,000 of the loan is either applied for additional construction or operating capital; also the patents and patent rights and all present and subsequently acquired assets of the borrower would be pledged as security until the full amount of the loan is paid.

The borrower is required to carry full insurance to cover replacement in event of fire, damage, or loss of the airships or other property purchased or constructed with the proceeds of the loan, until full payment is made. Insurance for these airships was taken up with a Lloyd's American representative, and at first 20 percent of the airships' value was required for annual payment. However, when further consideration was given to the suspension-bridge type of frame to be employed, the insurance charge was reduced to 15 percent and it was stated might be reduced to 10 percent.

The cost of insurance aptly illustrated the difference in the proposal submitted by the Department of Commerce and the present proposal for private construction and operation. Twenty percent annual insurance on \$10,750,000 for two airships of the Zeppelin type would amount to \$2,150,000, while 15 percent annually on the \$5,000,000 cost of two American-designed airships would be only \$750,000. Quite a difference, and similar differences would be shown by the sums required for depreciation, maintenance, interest, and so forth.

Another comparison is interesting. Mr. Mitchell, in presenting the Commerce Department airship-construction plan, told the Federal Aviation Commission that "Mr. Harpman, representative of the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation of Akron, Ohio, stated at our conference on the subject of airships that his company would enter into a contract for operation of the two airships and maintenance for 5 years on the basis of a dollar per year, if the Government desired them to submit a bid." This would seem to establish the value placed by the builders of the

two airships, for which the Government would be required to pay \$10,750,000.

Going back 4 years, when bill H. R. 8681 was before the House Commerce Committee, the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation offered to build airships and operate them in trans-Atlantic service to Germany if the Government would pay \$32 per mile—in both directions but carrying mail in only one direction—for a reservation of 10,000 pounds of mail. This charge of \$32 per mile for 8,000 miles, round trip to Germany, would have cost the Government \$256,000 for transporting 10,000 pounds of mail across the Atlantic to Germany, or for only 1 pound of mail if only that amount were forwarded.

The Commerce Committee, did, however, recommend a payment of \$20 per mile and the bill H. R. 8681 was approved on the floor of the House on June 15, 1932, thus a mail charge of \$16 per pound was approved.

With the loan of only \$12,000,000 the Respass Aeronautical Engineering Corporation proposes to establish twice-a-week airship service in both directions, carrying passengers, mail, and freight at only \$1.50 per pound. They do not require that the Government send any mail on its airships; but if the Post Office Department wishes to use its services the charge per pound is the same as reservation for passengers, \$1.50 per pound.

Further, instead of the Government buying airships at a high figure, possibly including a large profit, and leasing them back to the builders at \$1 per year rental, the Respass Aeronautical Engineering Corporation shall repay the full amount of the loan plus interest, will maintain the airships in first-class condition, set aside funds to replace the airships when it is deemed necessary to retire same and will carry full insurance to cover replacement if an airship is damaged or destroyed, as well as liability insurance for passengers, mail, and merchandise.

That airships can do this is because the Respass airships will be safer, stronger, have a much longer useful life, be capable of carrying a larger pay load, and because of their simplicity and ease of construction these airships may be built in America at lower cost than Zeppelin airships can be built, with cheaper labor, in Germany.

That Respass airships may be operated at an attractive profit is indicated by an estimate of the probable annual receipts and expenditures for such service, as contemplated for the construction and operation of two 7,000,000-cubic-foot airships, each making a round trip weekly between our Atlantic coast and England or Europe.

Operating charges

Administration and communications.....	\$300,000
Fuel and oil.....	850,000
Helium gas.....	300,000
Crew.....	300,000
Engine maintenance and replacement.....	500,000
Terminal charges.....	300,000
Contingencies.....	400,000
Insurance.....	750,000
Airship maintenance.....	500,000
Airship depreciation.....	500,000
Liquidation of construction loan.....	500,000
Interest at 3½ percent annually.....	175,000
Traffic solicitation and handling.....	680,000

6,035,000

Estimated income

	Pounds
Total pay load available each trip.....	48,000
Total load 208 trips.....	9,984,000
Average 75 percent full loads.....	7,488,000
Average 80 percent of schedule trips.....	5,958,400
Income with \$1.50 pound charge.....	\$8,937,600
Deduct operating charges.....	6,035,000
Net profit.....	2,902,600

These estimates were submitted with realization that no service of this character has ever been operated, and consequently the figures must be taken as approximate. A sincere effort was made to estimate the operating charges high and the prospective income low. It is fair to state also the pay load is believed will be much more than 48,000 pounds.

Airships for commercial operations of this character must be strong and flexible in order to resist unusual or expected stresses during all seasons of the year and in all kinds of weather. They must have speed of at least 100 miles per hour for rapid transportation and to avoid storms so far as may be possible. They must be able to operate at relatively high altitudes if necessary in order to avoid low storms or seek a level of most favorable air currents, and they must have these qualities without reduction of the useful load beyond the point of providing a profitable pay load.

There are two types of thoroughly tested engineering principles that may be employed in designing airship frames. One is that of the arch-type bridge, that requires a structural weight 40 percent greater than that of a suspension bridge of equal strength and capacity. If the arch-frame bridge were reduced 40 percent in weight it would not be capable of carrying the same load, and no bridge engineer could endorse the safety of such bridge for such load.

The suspension-bridge frame not only has the important advantage of reduced weight but receives stress on elastic steel bridge strand wire, and in this type of structure the stresses never reverse, therefore removing all fear of failure in the hull through fatigue and crystallization. In the operation of Zeppelin-frame airships reversal of stress, fatigue, and crystallization of the metal employed cannot be avoided.

That there is a need for safe American overseas airship service and ample opportunity for conducting such service profitably is supported by the House Committee on Commerce in its report on the merchant airship bill, House Resolution 8681, June 15, 1932, from which I take the following extracts:

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8681) to develop American air transport services overseas, to encourage the construction in the United States by American capital of American airships for use in foreign commerce, and to make certain provisions of the maritime law applicable to foreign commerce by airship, have considered the same and report thereon with amendments and, as so amended, recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to promote national defense and foreign trade by having suitable American aircraft serving such trade and available for use in time of war. The creation of commercial air-transport services overseas as a supplement to the American merchant marine is a possibility that has only now become practicable by recent advances in applied science. There is ample evidence that the time has now come to use the air as the medium for rapid transport of the urgent portion of our business representatives, samples, and mails to overseas markets.

The speed of steamships has about reached its economical limit. To maintain a speed of more than 24 knots requires vessels of enormous size and cost. Freight and passengers cannot be found to fill such superships except on the North Atlantic, and even there international rivalry supported by governments has only pushed the speed up to 28 knots. Naval architects propose the ultimate ship of 30-knot speed, to cost twice as much as a 24-knot vessel, saving 1 day in the Atlantic crossing. Such ships, flying our flag, will cost approximately \$30,000,000 each, of which amount three-fourths is required, under existing law, to be loaned by our Government at low rates of interest.

In the Pacific there is slight possibility of supporting from commercial revenues steamships of much greater speed than are now available. And yet in the Pacific our national and commercial interests may have the greater need for increased speed of transportation. To increase the speed of water transportation materially is usually prohibitive in cost, because the portion of passengers, mails, and goods that really require high speed is too small to fill at increased charges the great vessels needed to provide such speed.

The other side of the picture reveals the air over the sea as an available medium for the very high-speed transport by aircraft of this relatively small portion of the traffic now moving that is able to pay for time saved. Instead of a possible speed increase of 10 or 15 percent offered by steamships at a very great cost, aircraft offer the possibility of a speed increase of several hundred percent over existing means and at moderate cost. In other words, the economical speed for aircraft operations is high compared with that for vessel operations.

Today our trade and manufacture is not simply a matter of domestic industry and exchange. We have developed the principles and practices of quantity production to such an extent that we have become an exporting nation. This export field is new to our generation, but we are in competition with the old, experienced export nations of the world. If our future in this export field is to be a success we must proceed with a definite program of aggressiveness.

Once we had the leading position in the China trade until the Civil War destroyed the American merchant marine. We had the

cream of that carrying trade, because we had the swiftest sailing ships in those days of sail and wooden ships. It was speed that won us the tea and silk cargoes.

In the Atlantic we have no geographical advantage, and if we are to receive our share of trade we must take the lead in securing closer contacts and better relations. Here our problem of maintaining a reasonable position in foreign trade is one demanding the greatest application of American ingenuity.

Europe is fast learning the lesson of mass production from American industry, and with its present almost unchallenged position in the field of steamship transportation, bids fair to assume a commanding lead in the Atlantic trade to the exclusion of her American competitors.

In the Pacific, geography has been more favorable to us. We are in the enviable position of being closest to the largest concentration of population on earth. We must take those steps now which facilitate intercourse and increase accessibility.

It is 6 or 7 days from San Francisco to Honolulu by steamship (one ship only making it in 4 days—the fastest on the Pacific), and approximately 14 days to Japan. It is 3 weeks from California to Manila and even longer to Hong Kong or Shanghai. Two months must pass before the average letter receives a reply. Trade must develop slowly under such conditions. Speed is essential for letters and documents, for samples and high-class express traffic, for orders, for the service of filling these orders, and for the transport of business representatives.

The application of airships of the *Akron* type to trans-Pacific service has been represented to the committee by responsible American business and shipping men as promising a profound alteration in the effects of geographical distance. For example, Hawaii can be brought within 36 hours of California, giving not only obvious trade benefits but also a powerful corrective to the unfortunate effects of the relative inaccessibility of our primary Pacific fortress.

Airship service to Manila can cut the travel time from 3 weeks to 6 days, and bring Shanghai, Hong Kong, and Tokyo as close to our west coast as London, Paris, and Berlin are by steamship from our east coast. Airships on the North Atlantic can deliver passengers, mails, and express in Europe in less than half the time now taken by the faster foreign steamships.

Such overseas air-transport services will be supplemental to the merchant marine, which must continue to carry the bulk of passengers and mails and all of the heavy cargo. The merchant marine is supported by the volume of our foreign trade and will be benefited to the degree that airships succeed in stimulating this trade. Captain Dollar has well said, "When business representatives can visit their foreign customers more quickly they will go more often, get more orders, and our ships will get more cargoes."

The airship as a new vehicle for the service of our foreign trade can give an increase in speed over our existing fast steamers comparable to that following the replacement of sail by steam in the last century.

The volume of traffic now moving across the Pacific and Atlantic is enormous. For example, over 1,000,000 persons crossed the North Atlantic by steamship in 1930. Of these, 100,000 persons each way went first-class, and half of them booked passage at extra fares on the 10 fastest ships. An airship service to Europe, giving a sailing twice a week, would carry the small fraction of this traffic for whom time saving was really worth while.

Across the Pacific the present passenger traffic is very much less than on the North Atlantic. Even in 1929 but 100,000 persons crossed the Pacific. It is obvious that passengers do not travel when ships are slow and distances great. While the traffic available for the trans-Atlantic airship service is more than ample, the need for a speedier service across the Pacific is even more evident.

The weight of all mail dispatched from New York to Europe reaches annually nearly 40,000,000 pounds, of which about 3,850,000 pounds is first class. The weekly shipment of first-class mail by all steamers exceeds 69,000 pounds. With two airships sailing weekly, a large portion of this first-class mail could be expedited, but with a surcharge to the public in the form of an extra stamp the volume actually designated to be sent by air can be controlled by the post office. The post office can in this way adjust the relation between the compensation paid to the carrier and the surcharge paid to the post office.

Across the Pacific, like the passenger movement, the mail movement is less than across the Atlantic, the first-class portion of such mails being about 28 percent of Atlantic first-class mail. This quantity is within the capacity of airships to handle.

There is no international express business, but it is to be expected that a rapid air-transport service will develop such a business analogous to our domestic railway and air express. Newsreel films, machinery parts, style goods, plans, specifications, drugs and cultures, manuscripts, and samples may be counted on for such shipments. Also there will always be a great variety of miscellaneous merchandise which, through special attendant circumstances, must be shipped by the fastest means available regardless of cost. Such shipments may represent the specifications for new construction, a delayed order, machinery repair parts, technical apparatus, and the like.

There appears to be in our foreign trade a large potential volume of passengers, mail, and express that can benefit by time saving. These three classes of business should share in an equitable manner the expense of operating the Air Service.

The United States has in the past established itself as leader in fast overseas transportation, but today other nations have larger and faster ships. The construction and operation of these ships are possible only through very large Government construction loans and operation subsidies.

Rear Admiral H. I. Cone, retired, when chairman of the advisory committee of the United States Shipping Board Bureau, told the Federal Aviation Commission that "the Government should build a series of airships suitable for transoceanic passenger and express service." In that way, he declared, "the United States would assume world leadership in the aircraft industry, enabling us at the same time to recapture our lost position in the field of world shipping", adding "the United States will be left hopelessly behind unless we take steps for building airships to fill out our merchant marine."

In the consideration of building and operating commercial airships, with subsequent construction of additional airships with private capital, the operations as stated must be conducted at a profit. Thus, there are two vital points to be decided: The type and size of the airships to be constructed and the conditions under which the airships shall be operated.

In the choice of airships the type and size that provides the greatest strength and safety, with assurance of rendering the most valuable and commercial and military service, should be selected. The conditions under which the airships may be operated should give assurance of a reasonable profit, after providing for replacements, liquidation of principal, and interests on funds employed in the construction and in establishing the service.

I feel this is a matter of vital importance to our Nation. The airship is destined to become a major form of air transportation, and we will realize this fact within a very few years, perhaps after other nations have become well established, and we may not then obtain the dominating place, in overseas rapid transportation, which we may now achieve by prompt action.

Germany now has a sister ship to the *Hindenburg* under construction, is reported to be designing a larger airship, and is said to have signed a contract with Japan for two airships to be operated by Japan to our Pacific coast.

In conclusion, I desire to present some data concerning the possible value of the airship for military defense.

The *Akron* and the *Macon* had actual flying experience of only 3,257 hours before they met disaster through reported failure of their Zeppelin-type frame. How could such limited service determine the military value of airships?

Dr. William Hovgaard, member of the committee appointed by the Science Advisory Board to review and analyze the past and present situation as to the design and construction of airships, prepared an important article on Airships for Naval Service, published in the United States Naval Institute Proceedings, March 1936, in which the value of the airship for "coastal patrol-submarine detection", "strategic scouting—the airship as an airplane carrier", and "convoy and other services" is briefly but ably set forth.

Here is one outstanding aeronautical authority who appreciates the fundamental military value of airships. Under the section Convoy and Other Services Dr. Hovgaard says:

Rear Admiral W. A. Moffett has stated (before the House Committee on Naval Affairs, "During the World War, as far as we know, no convoy was ever attacked by a submarine when guarded by an airship."

Dr. Hovgaard further states:

It seems safe to say that for a country like the United States, with extensive coast lines, outlying possessions, and a great Navy, there will be, in time of war, a need for airships of all types from the smallest nonrigids to the largest rigid airships."

From a brief on airships, prepared at my request by Mr. Roland B. Respass, Cranston, R. I., inventor of the suspension-bridge airship frame, which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD July 2, 1935, I extract the following:

A properly designed and constructed commercial airship may be adapted for military service. The military airship would have no passengers; therefore the interior structure, that may be built

in for passenger use, could be removed and its weight, with the weight of the passengers, mail, express, and freight, would represent a very considerable lift that would be available for increasing the power for higher speed, for a larger quantity of fuel and oil for increased range of flight, or for military equipment such as airplanes, rapid-fire guns, ammunition, etc.

We are a commercial Nation. Airships for us should be constructed primarily as commercial carriers. Should we require these airships for military use we should change them, as explained, to be adapted for the particular military service to which they are intended to be employed.

For protecting our cities these great commercial airships could be quickly converted to carry many airplanes, have an airship speed exceeding 100 miles per hour, or be able to cruise slowly at a high altitude, over an area to be protected, sending out scouting airplanes to contact enemy planes, and when such planes are located the scout plane may direct the airships in a course to intercept the enemy planes. Thus, at the proper time, the airship may release a fleet of our most efficient fighting airplanes which may destroy the enemy airplane squadron.

If we had a sufficient number of these great convertible commercial airships, we could patrol and protect the areas surrounding our great centers of population and we could also establish and maintain a constant defense line a thousand miles from our coast, if desired.

The military value of an airship may be judged by its ability to withstand adverse weather conditions, by its useful load which may define its range, its speed, its military equipment, and by its likelihood of receiving serious injury when attacked by other aircraft.

The suspension-bridge structure of an airship is a type to stand adverse weather and is less vulnerable to gunfire than the Zeppelin-type frame. The gas is not under pressure and would leak very slowly, through holes made by bullets. Damage by heavier-than-air craft may occur only provided an airplane could get relatively close to the airship.

For military purposes the airship may be armed with a dozen or more rapid-fire long-range guns, so that at least two of these guns may cover approach to the airship in every direction. These guns could be fired with great accuracy and shoot farther than the guns carried by airplanes; thus in combat the airplane may seldom even puncture the fabric cover of the airship before the plane may be destroyed. In other words, the airship may be able to operate with less danger from enemy heavier-than-air craft than naval vessels.

As to the vulnerability of airships, so often referred to, our Navy ships are vulnerable to mines, submarines, surface vessels, and aircraft; our land forces are vulnerable on land and from the air, while the airship is vulnerable, over our own country, only to air attack. Nothing is safe in war.

LOOKING BACKWARD AT THE UTILITY HOLDING COMPANY BILL

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, almost 1 year has elapsed since passage by the Congress and the signing by the President of the utility holding company bill, which was presumed to be the panacea for all the ills of the consumer of electric power, and was proclaimed as being the bill that would produce cheap gas and electricity. On July 1, 1935, I stated in my remarks that "insofar as my district is concerned, whether they be privately or municipally owned, the 'death sentence' clause written into either the House or Senate bill will have no effect on the utility situation whatsoever, either from the standpoint of the consumer or the investor."

The "death sentence" would make no changes in the operation of the utilities in the Fifth District of Indiana. As it relates to my district, all the talk about the "death sentence" is a tempest in a teapot. It is much ado about nothing. At that time I voted for the bill as reported out by the committee of the House because I felt that it would regulate these utilities, and through such regulation the consumer and the investor would both profit, and I contended continuously that insofar as the "death sentence" in the Senate bill was concerned that while it might help certain districts in the United States by destroying a few companies, that it would not help the consumer one bit or destroy a single company in my district in Indiana; that the bill was so worded that it would specifically prevent any relief to the people in my district in Indiana. Despite my efforts and the efforts of those who felt as I did, the House bill was defeated and the provision of the Senate bill substituted therefor.

I again repeat that 1 year has elapsed since the bill became effective, and insofar as my district is concerned, every

company that was doing business before the passage of the bill, either as a privately owned utility or a municipally owned utility, is still doing business at the same old stand, in the same old way, and with the same old rates in effect that were in effect when the bill was passed. The consumer of electricity or gas furnished by these utilities has not received one cent of reduction in their rates or their bills.

I have just received from the public service commission of my State the schedule of rates in effect in my district on the date that the bill was passed and the rates in effect today. In the city of Kokomo, Ind., electric light and power is furnished by the Northern Indiana Power Co. This same utility has given the service in Kokomo, Ind., for a number of years and is the only public utility giving electric light and power service in the city of Kokomo today. Their rates for residential service in effect on the day the bill was passed are as follows: For the first 30 kilowatt-hours per month, 6.5 cents per kilowatt-hour; for the next 30 kilowatt-hours used in the same month, 4.5 cents per kilowatt-hour; for all over 60 kilowatt-hours used in the same month, 2.5 cents per kilowatt-hour. Despite the fact that the bill was passed last session of Congress those rates are still applicable and the residential users in the city of Kokomo are being billed on that basis today. The Kokomo Gas & Fuel Co. supplies gas for lighting, heating, and cooking purposes in the city of Kokomo. Its rates as filed with the public service commission and effective February 1, 1934, to the small family consumers were as follows: First 10,000 cubic feet per month, \$1.50 per M cubic feet. This utility makes a minimum charge of \$1 per month whether the gas is used or not. If the bill is not paid within 15 days after the due date a collection charge of 6 percent is made on the first \$3; 3 percent on the next \$60. If the bill is not paid on the 16th day after being rendered the gas may be disconnected and if the consumer on the 16th day after due date pays his bill he must pay this additional percentage for the delay and a \$1 charge for reconnection. These rates are still in effect in the city of Kokomo today and the consumer in the city of Kokomo has not profited one single cent through the passage of the utility holding company bill.

In the city of Peru, Ind., gas service is distributed through the Northern Indiana Public Service Co., a subsidiary of the old Insull empire. On the date that the holding-company bill was passed the rates of this public utility in effect in Peru, Ind., were as follows: First 2,000 cubic feet per month, \$1.25 per thousand cubic feet (\$1.35 gross); next 18,000 cubic feet per month, \$1 per thousand cubic feet (\$1.10 gross). Under the tariffs filed with and approved by the Indiana Public Service Commission, bills must be paid within 10 days, including the day rendered, to receive the net rate and if not paid in such 10-day period (which, in fact, in this instance, may be a 9-day period) the gross rate is applied. There is a \$1 reconnection charge and a \$12-per-year meter charge. These rates were made effective July 1, 1927, and despite the passage of the so-called "death sentence" utility holding company bill, are still in effect today, and the citizens of Peru, Ind., who must obtain their gas from this public utility, have not profited a single cent in the reduction of rates or in the reduction of their monthly bills by virtue of this act of Congress. In this same city the municipality owns the electric-light plant and furnishes and distributes electric light and power. The rates in effect for the municipality-furnished electric light to residents on the day that the holding-company bill was passed were: First 50 kilowatt-hours per month, 5 cents per kilowatt-hour; next 50 kilowatt-hours, 3 cents per kilowatt-hour; next 50 kilowatt-hours, 2 cents per kilowatt-hour; over 150 kilowatt-hours per month, 1½ cents per kilowatt-hour.

These rates are still in effect today, and I know of no complaint against these rates as they are far below the rates charged by the privately owned utilities in neighboring cities. The plant is operated efficiently and making money every month of the year, the profits being used to reduce local taxes and applied to projects of benefit to the residents of the city. However, the passage of the utility holding company

bill by the Congress has had no effect whatsoever on the rates of this municipally owned utility, they being the same as were in effect on the date of the passage of the bill.

The Central Indiana Gas Co., a privately owned public utility, furnishes gas to the city of Marion, Ind. The rates in effect April 1, 1935, and still in effect in the city of Marion today, are as follows: First 2,000 cubic feet per month, \$1.25 per M cubic feet; next 3,000 cubic feet per month, 90 cents per M cubic feet. All over 5,000 cubic feet per month, 75 cents per M cubic feet. There is a minimum charge of \$1.50. If bills are not paid in 15 days from the date of the bill, 10 percent additional for all bills under \$3 is charged, and 3 percent on all bills over \$3. Despite all the argument of the proponents of the utility holding company bill of the vast advantages in reduced rates that the passage of the bill would mean to the consumer, these same rates for gas are effective in the city of Marion today.

In this same city of Marion, Ind., the Indiana General Service Co., a privately owned utility and a subsidiary of the American Gas & Electric Co., the company that Dr. Splawn and members of the committee held up to the House as the perfect system, supplies electric light and power. The members of the committee, as well as Dr. Splawn, the expert of the committee, stated the truth about this company—they admitted that the "death sentence" clause in the holding-company bill would not affect it in Indiana, and it has not. The rates in effect for residential use on April 1, 1935, in Marion, Ind., were as follows: First 200 kilowatt-hours per month, 7.5 cents per kilowatt-hour; next 300 kilowatt-hours per month, 6.7 cents per kilowatt-hour; the next 300 kilowatt-hours per month, 5.7 cents per kilowatt-hour. All in excess of 800 kilowatt-hours per month, 4.7 cents per kilowatt-hour. There is a \$1 per month minimum charge. Five percent is added if bills are not paid in full on or before the 10th day after date of mailing of the bills. These same rates that were in effect in Marion when the bill was passed are still in effect. The passage of the bill has not reduced the price of the stock of this utility. It is worth as much today as it was on the day the bill was passed.

I could give many other examples covering every city, town, or village in my district. To do so would be merely cumulative evidence, piling proof on top of proof. It would merely be corroborative evidence of the truth of my remarks in the RECORD of last session.

Time at last sets all things even. These facts concerning the holding-company bill and its effect on consumers I brought to the attention of the House not as a dilatory matter but in the hope of really obtaining some benefit for the consumer. I was more interested at that time in giving aid to the millions of innocent consumers who suffered from excessive utility rates than I was in wreaking vengeance by punishment of a very few guilty stock promoters. I believe in the maxim that the supreme function of the law is to protect the weak and restrain the strong but with me as in the maxim the protection of the weak comes first. Under the defeated House provisions for which I voted, regulation of the utilities would have been mandatory and the weak consumer protected from excessive rates. When the bill was up for passage, Members had their fancy touched by the phrase "death sentence." The power of oratory and the manipulation of words put judgment to sleep and while reason slumbered this legislation became law. Men were worked into a frenzy of fear by the cry of "wolf" until the protection of the sheep was submerged in the cry for blood. Today we know by the actual rates charged how little the consumer gained by the law. The proof of the futility of a "death sentence" law that does not kill is contained in the utility rates in effect today in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana.

The only effect that the passage of the holding-company bill with the Senate "death sentence" provision attached has had on the people in that district either favorable or adverse, is that it has reduced the value of the stock of utilities in some other sections of the country, leaving the citizens of the district who had innocently and on the recommendation of

their bankers and the approval of the State security commission invested in those stocks and bonds lost. Most of them were people who had invested their life savings obtained through years of toil and who could ill afford to lose the investment. The value of their stock meant to them the difference between a comfortable old age and destitution.

The effect of legislation can always be judged by looking backward. I look back today to the time of the passage of the law. The finding of a court must be predicated upon the evidence presented. The evidence is conclusive that the law has been detrimental to investors in my district who held stock in public utilities doing business in other States and at the same time has not benefited the consumer in the district. The consumer is in status quo. Judgment must be entered on the finding.

FEDERAL AGENCIES HELP TO SAVE OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the citizenship and Nation-building accomplishments of the P. W. A. are so numerous and varied that time and space will permit me to give a very few of the virtues of this work. Therefore, I shall devote this time to setting forth some accomplishments in the field of education.

We all realize that education in a democracy is absolutely necessary. When President Roosevelt was inaugurated in 1933 we had hundreds of local and county situations similar to this: They were unable to collect taxes, millions of citizens without work, without sufficient clothing, short on food. The States, counties, and municipalities were forced to retrench. Many schools were closed, teachers were discharged, salaries cut, sometimes paid in script or not at all.

The educational system in America was slipping. The retrenchments of all kinds were turning millions of boys and girls out on our highways and byways to join the army of unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, it is when young men and young women see no ray of hope in the future and are out of work that they become dissatisfied. It is such conditions that breed communism and other isms detrimental to a democracy. The idle brain is the devil's workshop. The criminal records show that 25 percent of our criminals are under 21 years of age. Thousands of these young men became criminals because they were idle and their activities were not properly guided.

President Roosevelt and the Congressmen of the United States realized that something had to be done to give hope to the youth of our Nation. To establish the C. C. C. camps, taking care of some half million of men and boys was fine, but that was not enough. Something else had to be done, and as a result, through the different agencies set up by Congress, such as the P. W. A., the Federal Emergency Relief Corporation, the Civil Works Administration, and other agencies, funds were provided for rural schools, for adult education, for aid to college students, for assistance in building and repairing school buildings, and so forth.

In 1933 one-half of all the men, women, and children in Fayette County, my district, were either on relief or on the verge of relief. Most of the others were unable to pay taxes, and as a result the education of our youth was being neglected. This was true in a measure throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, here are a few of the things accomplished for the education of our youth and our people through the agencies set up by the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses:

- (a) Added 3,100 classrooms.
- (b) Made accommodations for 1,217,000 additional students to public-school facilities.
- (c) Four thousand educational buildings constructed. This was 75 percent of all the new construction in the United States.

(d) More than 1,200,000 additional seats were provided for the schools in the United States.

(e) One thousand six hundred and fifty educational buildings were completely overhauled.

(f) Twenty-nine thousand six hundred and thirty-six new classrooms were provided.

(g) One hundred and seventy-six million eight hundred and eighty-one thousand two hundred and ninety-seven dollars was given to build new high schools.

(h) Cost of construction of elementary schools was \$139,831,127.

(i) Thirty-two million one hundred and thirty-one thousand one hundred and sixty-six dollars of Federal funds were given to districts for libraries, laboratories, auditoriums, and so forth.

(j) Loans and grants to colleges and universities amounted to \$64,411,093.

(k) Thirty million dollars for Indian schools and Naval and Military Academies.

(l) Through P. W. A. aid new schools have been built in every State. For instance: North Carolina, 264; Pennsylvania, 246; New York, 212; Illinois, 165; California, 474.

(m) In 1933-34 the situation in rural schools, as well as district schools, became so acute that something had to be done. Thus, \$14,878,385 was allotted by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to rural school districts throughout the United States to keep the schools open. In 1935 an additional \$6,922,000 was allotted for the same purpose.

(n) In the field of adult education, 1,650,000 men and women were enrolled. Five hundred and fifty thousand men and women have been taught to read and write.

(o) Nine-four thousand three hundred and thirty-one students in 1,466 colleges and universities were aided in getting an education.

Mr. Speaker, it would be better if school districts, whether they be townships, boroughs, cities, counties, or States, provided for their own education. However, that seems impossible in many districts. In order to keep open the schools at all, it was necessary to get help from the Federal Government.

If Fayette County, one of the counties in my district, was to pay all of the costs of running their public schools, they would have to levy 60 mills of school taxes each year. That is, they would have to levy it to run the schools as they are run this year. The schools in my district are run as well as the schools in any district in the United States, and better than most of them in the Nation, but we must adjust our educational facilities in order to equip boys and girls to go out into life's work. We must give them training in home-making, industrial arts, agricultural arts, because most of them will have to make their living with their hands and their head when they get out.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the Social Security Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to extend my remarks that I may briefly refer to the Social Security Act, particularly insofar as it relates to old-age pensions. I was most enthusiastically in favor of this legislation when it was before the House and enacted into law during the last session of the present Congress. I was happy to give it my best support. I am still in favor of this legislation but must confess my enthusiasm is somewhat chilled since I find that the law as now interpreted really brings little added relief to the beneficiaries, except possibly that it may prompt the several States to more liberal allowances.

When the bill was debated in the House it was repeatedly stated that by its passage the Government would match dollar for dollar up to \$15 per month old-age pensions paid by the several States. I understood then that this meant a beneficiary who was then receiving or who would hereafter receive a monthly pension of \$15 or more per month from the State, that such pensions would be increased up to \$15 per month by Federal contribution or

\$30 per month. In good faith I so informed by letter and by word of mouth many of my constituents the above facts. I was quite happy over the prospects that the old folks who are needy and dependent would receive at least \$30 per month, which while not a very generous allowance would help materially to alleviate the plain wants and necessities of their declining days.

When I to my great regret and surprise learned that no increases of pensions had been made in my State, Ohio, although the Federal Government made its contribution to the States beginning February 1, last, I began to make inquiry. I wrote to Hon. John G. Winant, chairman of the Social Security Board, the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12, 1936.

Hon. JOHN G. WINANT,

Chairman, Social Security Board, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WINANT: When I voted for the Social Security Act it was with the understanding that the Government was to match dollar for dollar up to \$15 per month the amount paid by the States for old-age pensions.

I have had several letters from my State, Ohio, that there has been and would be no increase in the old-age pensions and that the Federal contribution simply pays one-half of the pension which has heretofore been paid to old-age pensioners by the State. This surely must be an incorrect interpretation of the law. I have written many of my constituents that their pensions would be increased up to \$15 per month by Federal contribution, which was my understanding of this legislation.

I will thank you very much for illumination on the above.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK.

I received the following reply from Mr. Winant:

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,

Washington, D. C., May 16, 1936.

Hon. WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ASHBROOK: This will acknowledge your letter of May 12. The basis on which Federal grants-in-aid to States for old-age assistance is made is as follows:

The Federal Government will pay to the State having an approved old-age assistance plan one-half of the total amount of money expended by the State for old-age assistance up to an amount which does not exceed \$30 per month per individual receiving such assistance.

In other words, if the State plan provides for the payment to needy aged individuals \$20 a month, \$10 of this amount will come from Federal funds. If the State provides for \$30 per month per individual, \$15 of this amount will come from Federal funds. Fifteen dollars per month is the maximum Federal contribution authorized by title I of the Social Security Act.

I am attaching copy of information circular no. 1, A Brief Explanation of the Social Security Act.

Sincerely,

Enclosure.

JOHN G. WINANT, Chairman.

I quote from the information circular no. 1, mentioned in Mr. Winant's letter, the following:

(1) Old-age assistance (immediate payment plan).—A State may submit to the Social Security Board for approval its plan for old-age assistance. The Board is directed to approve such plans as conform to certain requirements as to eligibility, such as age, residence, and citizenship; and to requirements as to State operation and standards of administration, intended to assure proper and efficient State action by the enactment and administration of laws which may reasonably be expected to provide assistance to needy aged individuals without discrimination. After the plan is approved, the State receives from the Federal Government an amount equal to one-half the sum expended for old-age assistance by the State with respect to individuals 65 years or older who are not inmates of public institutions. The Federal Government matches on a 50-50 basis every dollar spent by the State for old-age assistance, but does not contribute more than \$15 per month for any individual. In addition the Federal Government pays for administrative expenses an amount equal to 5 percent of the sum granted to the State.

I have capitalized certain lines that they may be more forcibly brought to your attention and account for what now seems to be my misunderstanding of the rather vague law. You will note the specific words which brought about my misunderstanding and I think quite likely many other Members made the same construction of the law. This sentence reads:

The Federal Government matches on a 50-50 basis every dollar spent by the State for old-age assistance, but does not contribute more than \$15 per month for any individual.

It was my understanding that the Federal contribution of \$15 per month would increase pensions \$15 per month up to \$30 per month. In other words, a pensioner who received

\$15 per month from the State would receive \$15 per month additional from the Federal Government, or \$30 per month. It now appears that unless the States increase pensions up to \$30 per month there will be no increase of pensions, which, to express myself as mildly as possible, is a very great disappointment to me.

I also wrote Hon. H. J. Berroddin, who is the chief of the division of aid for the aged of Ohio, the following letter:

Hon. H. J. BERRODDIN,

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 18, 1936.

Division of Aid for the Aged, Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR MR. BERRODDIN: I am considerably disturbed about the old-age pensions. My understanding was when I voted for the Social Security Act that the Federal Government would match up to \$15 per month pensions paid by the several States. I am advised from several sources in my district that there is to be no increase in the old-age pensions and that the State will simply continue to pay the same pensions and use the Federal aid to reimburse itself 50 percent.

If the above is true, I did not know what I was voting for when I voted for this legislation, and it is needless to say that I am hopeful that I have been misinformed. I would thank you to advise me what your interpretation of the law is and what the State will do with the money allocated to it by the Federal Government.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK.

Here follows reply from Mr. Berroddin to my letter:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
DIVISION OF AID FOR THE AGED,
Columbus, Ohio, May 27, 1936.

Congressman WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASHBROOK: I have your letter expressing yourself as considerably disturbed about old-age pensions in Ohio. I believe this is because of your misunderstanding of the intent and purpose of the law. The title of the Ohio law is "Aid for the Aged" and this conforms with the Social Security Act which likewise is entitled "Aid for the Aged."

From the standpoint of the State and Federal Government, there is no such thing as an old-age pension. It is aid for the aged. It is not a dole, but an economic adjustment of unpaid compensation to lawful citizens, known as "Aid for the Aged."

The budget plan, based on actual needs, is followed in arriving at awards. Expenditures for food, shelter, clothing, and miscellaneous items are estimated for the year. Any contributions from responsible relatives is taken into consideration, also if there is income from any source, and after deductions are made, the amount of aid is arrived at. The present maximum award in Ohio is \$25 per month. However, when the amended law goes into effect July 16, the maximum award will be \$30 per month. The maximum award, of course, will be granted in cases where the recipient's budget indicates that the maximum is needed.

The Federal Government reimburses the State to the extent of one-half the amount of the award. Of the 21 States approved for Federal aid by the Social Security Board, Ohio has the largest number of recipients and is paying out the most money. Ohio and Michigan are the only two States that are paying a funeral award in addition to aid. We now have approximately 90,000 recipients of aid. The total amount of aid paid to recipients for the month of April was \$1,350,000. Burial claims paid for the month of March totaled 468 in the amount of \$26,308.98. The Federal Government does not reimburse the State for funeral awards.

In order to conform with the Social Security Act, the residence requirements in Ohio have been reduced from 15 years to 5 years in the last 9; and it is estimated that this reduction in the residence requirements alone will increase our rolls by at least 10,000 recipients.

The citizenship requirement of 15 years is also changed to mere citizenship; and this amendment will add a considerable number. The change in the property requirements will add perhaps another 8,000 or 10,000 recipients to our rolls.

With these additions, Ohio will continue to be confronted with the tremendous problem of raising sufficient funds for payment of awards to the aged. In 1935 the cost of aid was approximately \$14,000,000 while the estimated cost for 1936 is \$20,000,000. Were we to make a general increase to anywhere near the maximum award under the amended law, it would be necessary to levy new taxes to meet the increased cost, and these would be added to the heavy burden under which the State is already laboring. No doubt the individual average can be raised, but not to the extent of the aid received from the Federal Government.

We believe that the broad general purpose underlying the plan of Federal aid is to assist the States in carrying the heavy load that they have in providing aid for the aged; and this object would be defeated were the States to increase their awards automatically to the extent of the Federal grants. Were this done, the States would be as hard pressed as before, to raise sufficient revenue to meet their share of the aid.

There is another point which must not be overlooked, and that is that the Federal Government has taken off the relief rolls all persons 65 years or more of age who can qualify for old-age assistance; and the average award under the assistance law is higher than that which these same persons were receiving from relief.

Assuring you of our desire to cooperate in every way possible in administering this law so as to confer the greatest benefit upon the greatest number, I remain,

Very truly yours,

H. J. BERRODDIN,
Chief, Division of Aid for the Aged.

It will be observed by the letters from both Mr. Winant and Mr. Berroddin that the passage of the Social Security Act by this Congress will mean little or nothing to the old folks back home who have been existing somehow on a small monthly pension, a pittance far from adequate for their most frugal living expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I think everyone who knows much about my record and sympathies, both here and in my district, knows that I have long been an advocate and believer that the fortunate have responsibility to the unfortunate. I am proud to confess that due to my activity for liberal pensions of war veterans and their dependents during my years of service here that I am dubbed "Pension Bill" back home.

I have been for 30 years a member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and it is well known that this great fraternal organization is the sponsor of old-age pensions. I believe sincerely and conscientiously in reasonable old-age pensions. I am sure the people quite generally believe today as never before that we are "our brother's keeper", and that the strong must protect the weak. We must look this great question squarely in the face and not shirk from our responsibilities.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I was under the delusion when I voted for the Social Security Act that it meant an increase in old-age pensions, and since I find it means no increase, there are just two things that must and should be done. First, the several States should immediately increase all old-age pensions to at least \$30 per month, \$15 contributed by the State and \$15 by the Federal Government; or, second, in the event that this is not done, Congress, at the next session, should enact legislation making sure and certain further and more liberal relief to all worthy old-age beneficiaries, and to that end I pledge my unswerving support.

I am hopeful that the other provisions of the Social Security Act will not prove to be as disappointing as that which relates to the aid for the aged.

FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein two short letters and two brief extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks and including letters received by me from the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, the Maryland Farm Bureau Federation, a resolution passed by the Maryland Farm Bureau Federation, and an extract from an article appearing in the National Grange of October 1935:

[American Farm Bureau Federation. General offices, 58 East Washington St., Chicago, Ill. Legislative department, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 1, 1936.

Hon. T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOLDSBOROUGH: At the approach of the end of the present session of Congress, I know you will permit me to write you to express my personal appreciation and that of the entire American Farm Bureau Federation for your activities in behalf of agriculture during the session and throughout prior years.

I cannot forget also the wonderful speech, mostly devoted to monetary matters, which you delivered at the last annual meeting of the federation in Chicago, Ill., in December 1935, which address made a tremendous impression on our people.

Your activities as a Member of the House of Representatives are always useful from farm points of view, and I constantly find you trying to help us on the legislative projects which relate to the welfare of agriculture.

There are many efforts, however, which lie ahead of us, great as have been some of the triumphs which already we have enjoyed. I feel sure it will be possible in future years, as in the

past, for those of us who represent the federation to continue to work with you in bettering the economic conditions which surround agriculture.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
CHESTER H. GRAY,
Washington Representative.

[The National Grange. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. National Grange officers: L. J. Taber, master, Columbus, Ohio; J. C. Farmer, lecturer, South Newbury, N. H.; R. P. Robinson, treasurer, Wilmington, Del.; Harry A. Caton, secretary, Coshocton, Ohio. Executive committee: F. J. Freestone, chairman, Interlaken, N. Y.; E. A. Eckert, secretary, Mascoutah, Ill.; Ray W. Gill, Portland, Oreg.; L. F. Taber, ex officio, Columbus, Ohio]

MAY 28, 1936.

HON. THOMAS A. GOLDSBOROUGH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Referring to our conversation of yesterday, I want to thank you for the active part you have taken in seeing that the interests of farm cooperative organizations will be adequately safeguarded under the bill to regulate chain stores.

We are, of course, in favor of proper steps to put an end to false brokerage and advertising allowances, unreasonable quantity discounts, and other abuses that this proposed legislation seeks to correct. We are concerned, however, that the rights of legitimate farm cooperative associations shall not be unwittingly impaired. I know that you feel the same way about it.

Assuring you that we appreciate the loyal service to agriculture that has characterized your career as a Congressman, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

FRED BRECKMAN,
Washington Representative.

[The National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, National Headquarters, Washington, D. C. Officers: N. P. Hull, president; John Brandt, first vice president; W. P. Davis, second vice president; George W. Slocum, treasurer; Charles W. Holman, secretary. Office of the secretary, 1731 Eye Street, NW.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 27, 1936.

HON. T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOLDSBOROUGH: As the present session of Congress draws near to adjournment, we want to take this opportunity to thank you for your support in connection with legislation affecting the dairy farmers of this country.

Not only do we appreciate the work that you have done in Congress for dairy farmers, but we also desire to express our appreciation for your leadership in the battle which agriculture is waging for an honest dollar.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, the National Cooperative
Milk Producers' Federation.

[Maryland Agricultural Society, Maryland Farm Bureau Federation, Sherwood Building, North Avenue and Charles, office of the secretary-treasurer. Affiliated organizations: Maryland State Horticultural Society, Maryland State Dairymen's Association, Maryland Crop Improvement Association, Maryland State Beekeepers' Association, Maryland State Vegetable Growers' Association, The Agricultural Corporation of Maryland, Maryland Tobacco Growers' Association, Maryland Stockmen's Association, Maryland State Poultry Association, Maryland Horse Breeders' Association]

BALTIMORE, MD., March 2, 1936.

HON. T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOLDSBOROUGH: I wish to thank you in the name of the Maryland Farm Bureau for the support you gave the soil conservation bill.

In addition I want to thank you for inserting our resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We greatly appreciate the fine support you have always rendered the farmers of this State.

Very truly yours,

C. E. WISE, JR.,
Secretary-Treasurer, Maryland Farm Bureau Federation.

The past 6 years have seen the general price level go from the high level of 1929 to the low of 1932.

The experiences of the past have proved that in an abrupt price-level change salaries always lag from 5 to 10 years behind prices. Farm prices today are still out of fair relation to taxes, freight rates, farm machinery, professional services, etc.

During a time that price disparity exists, interchange of goods between farm groups and other groups is greatly decreased. Farmers with low purchasing power meet only necessary obligations, their farm buildings and equipment suffer, education and health are neglected, and millions of idle men walk the street.

Prosperity cannot return when agriculture furnishes one-sixth the Nation's capital, represents one-fourth the gainfully employed labor, and receives only one-tenth the national income.

On May 8 last, Representative ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH, of our State, introduced an amendment to the banking bill which was

lost by a vote of 122 to 128. Had this amendment passed, it would have made it mandatory that the price level be raised to the 1926 level. It would have created legislation to prevent violent price-level fluctuations: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we reaffirm our position on backing the A. F. B. F. in their program for monetary reform.

We believe that the right time to enact legislation, to restore price levels, and create a managed currency is now, while the entire Nation knows that the need exists: Be it further

Resolved, That we send a copy of this resolution to President O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and to the committee for the Nation.

[Extract from an article appearing in the National Grange of October 1935 in reference to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System]

Besides securing a direct representative of agriculture on the Board, various agricultural leaders also favor the appointment of Congressman T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH, of Maryland. Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, who is serving his eighth consecutive term as a Member of the House, is one of the most prominent members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

During the recent session of Congress he made an active fight to secure some amendments to the banking and currency bill intended to promote monetary stabilization, in harmony with the declared policies of the major farm organizations of the country.

WAR AND PEACE

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. O'MALLEY] may be permitted to extend his own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, no question that can come before a legislative body carries with it such dire possibilities of destruction, sorrow, and disillusionment to a people than the question of war. We as a people are a peace-loving people, and the citizens of our Nation have every right to be informed as to the position of their representatives on war, neutrality, and peace.

During my service in Congress I have consistently tried to carry out my platform and the personal pledges in the interests of peace made to the citizens of my district in the campaigns preceding the honor they have bestowed upon me by electing me to represent them in this legislative body. On all legislation carrying with it decisions of policy of our country in connection with war and peace, I have endeavored to make clear my position and what I believe to be the position of the district I represent.

The demoralizing, disheartening, and destructive effect of America's last participation in armed conflict has been brought home to us so graphically that we cannot or must not soon forget the terrible lessons of war. With these lessons in mind I have sponsored legislation in the House in an endeavor to make the danger of war for our country more remote. Chief of my antiwar bills has been House Joint Resolution 13, providing for a constitutional amendment which, if adopted, would make it impossible for Congress to ever again conscript men for armed service without first conscripting wealth and industry for service without profit.

Another measure introduced by me in the Seventy-fourth Congress and which I believe to be another step in eliminating the possibilities of our country being involved in war is my bill—H. R. 12216—prohibiting the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy from using American armed forces for the protection of private interests located in foreign countries. This measure is designed to prevent a repetition of such use of our Military Establishment as occurred under Republican administrations in the interference of American marines in internal disputes in friendly countries such as Nicaragua and other Latin American countries.

Whenever the opportunity has offered I have endeavored to express to the House my position on the various peace, war, and neutrality measures coming before the House for both debate and vote. It is not only the duty of a representative to cast his vote on all measures of importance which might affect his people, but it also is the duty of that representative to keep his constituents informed not only as to his actions but as to his expressions and opinions upon vital issues. With this in mind I have noted from the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD those portions of debates on war and

peace in which I have participated during my service in Congress.

Limitation on the number of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD available to each Congressman makes it impossible to provide the interested citizens of my district with the record of the daily debates. Because of this limitation and because I believe citizens are entitled to full and complete knowledge of the recorded expressions of their representatives, I call particular attention to those portions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which that important issue, war or peace, has been discussed and decided upon in the House.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11687) to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11687) to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered (8).

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered (1) (4) (5) (6) (7) (9) (10) (11) (12) and (13), and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered (2): That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered (2), and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$14,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered (3): That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered (3), and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$14,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered (14): That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered (14), and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: By substituting in lieu of said amendment (14) the following:

"Sec. 10. (a) That all taxes levied by any State, Territory or the District of Columbia upon sales of gasoline and other motor vehicle fuels may be levied, in the same manner and to the same extent, upon such fuels when sold by or through post exchanges, ship stores, ship service stores, commissaries, filling stations, licensed traders, and other similar agencies, located on United States military or other reservations, when such fuels are not for the exclusive use of the United States. Such taxes, so levied, shall be paid to the proper taxing authorities of the State, Territory or the District of Columbia, within whose borders the reservation affected may be located.

"(b) The officer in charge of such reservation shall, on or before the fifteenth day of each month, submit a written statement to the proper taxing authorities of the State, Territory or the District of Columbia within whose borders the reservation is located, showing the amount of such motor fuel not sold for the exclusive use of the United States during the preceding month."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
LINDSAY C. WARREN,
WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT
(except as to amendment no. 5),
C. MURRAY TURPIN,
Managers on the part of the House.
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
LYNN J. FRAZIER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11687) to amend the Federal Highway Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of said amendments, viz:

Amendments

Amendment no. 1: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to apportion Federal-aid highway funds without matching in any State where the proceeds of all special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation are applied to highway purposes, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment no. 2: Authorizes \$14,000,000 for forest highways, roads, and trails for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, instead of the \$10,000,000 proposed by the House, and in lieu of the \$20,000,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment no. 3: Authorizes \$14,000,000 for forest highways, roads, and trails for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, instead of the \$10,000,000 proposed by the House, and in lieu of the \$20,000,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment no. 4: Contains provisos for the expenditure of funds for foreign highways, roads, and trails, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment no. 5 provides for an authorization of \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1938, and June 30, 1939, for the construction and maintenance of parkways to give access to national parks and national monuments, over lands to which title has been transferred to the United States, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment no. 6 provides for an authorization for each of the fiscal years 1938 and 1939 of \$4,000,000 for the construction and improvement of Indian reservation roads, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment no. 7 provides for the necessary change in the number of the section.

Amendment no. 8 strikes out the provision for dealing with county authorities or other subdivisions, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment no. 9 strikes out the provision for the establishment of a section of rural roads, as proposed by the House.

Amendment no. 10 provides for the necessary change in the number of the section.

Amendment no. 11 provides that the appropriations authorized can only be made for highway and railroad grade-crossing eliminations where safety devices are installed, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment no. 12 provides for change in the number of the section.

Amendment no. 13 provides for change in the number of the section.

Amendment no. 14: Proposes the collection of all taxes levied by any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia upon gasoline or other motor-vehicle fuels sold through post exchanges, ships service stores, commissaries, filling stations, licensed traders located on United States military or other reservations when not for the exclusive use of the United States, as proposed by the Senate.

WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
LINDSAY C. WARREN,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
C. MURRAY TURPIN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT
(except as to amendment no. 5),
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT] will yield us such time as is necessary to discuss this matter.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think perhaps if the gentleman will explain it and give us some time, perhaps 25 or 30 minutes. There is a question as to whether the House should recede and concur in amendment no. 5, and I think, as far as I know, that is the only amendment in controversy.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Would 15 minutes be sufficient?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, no. That is not enough. There are quite a number on this side who would like to be heard. Will the gentleman yield me 30 minutes?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Cannot the gentleman get along with 20 minutes?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think perhaps that will be satisfactory.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman explain what the conference report does first?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is agreed that we are yielded 20 minutes?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this is the ordinary and regular bill which the Congress has been passing for the past several years. Section 1 provides for \$125,000,000, ordinarily called the matching fund.

Section 2 authorizes funds for forest highways, roads, and trails.

Section 3, roads through public lands.

Section 4, roads through national parks.

Section 5 is a new provision, which provides for farm-to-market roads.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman state for the benefit of the House how much money is provided in section 5 for farm-to-market roads? It would also be helpful to advise the amount provided for highway grade crossings.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Twenty-five million dollars for farm-to-market roads, but they get more from other sources.

Section 6 provides for grade-crossing eliminations, \$50,000,000 a year, which is all they get. However, the provisions about which you ask are not in conference, therefore, are not under discussion here, but I am glad to answer your question.

Section 7 provides for surveys and plans; for the engineering, making blue prints, and so forth.

We had extensive hearings before the Committee on Roads. The Senate also conducted hearings. There were some slight changes made which sent the matter to conference. After several hours in session we have agreed on this report with the one exception which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] wishes to discuss.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman permit a question in regard to one portion of the report? Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I desire to direct the gentleman's attention to Senate amendment no. 8, having to do with the allocation of the money for the improvement of farm-to-market roads during the fiscal years 1936 and 1937. Some Members of the House, including myself, feel that, as a matter of policy, it would be better to have all of the money allocated to farm-to-market roads spent under the jurisdiction of the county authorities. The Senate amendment proposes to permit the Bureau of Public Roads in the discretion of its Director, or Chief, to deal with the county authorities on these farm-to-market roads for the present fiscal year and for the fiscal year 1937. It seems that the conferees have agreed to eliminate the Senate amendment. I should like to know just why that was done and why the conferees were not of the opinion that the county authorities might be trusted to deal with these roads that are under their jurisdiction; why it was thought necessary to have State highway boards, which have control only over State highway systems, exclusively handle this money intended for farm-to-market roads?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that the conferees gave this matter very careful consideration; and while they would like to help the situation in Georgia, they thought it was too much of a departure from the usual custom of handling Federal funds and would establish a precedent. If the whole United States should do this it would mean that the road funds would be handled by over 3,000 county commissions instead of the 48 State highway commissions.

Mr. TARVER. I made no reference in my question to the situation in Georgia. I addressed myself to the question of general policy, as to whether or not county commissioners rather than State highway boards ought to have control of funds intended for farm-to-market roads which are under the jurisdiction of county commissioners and not of State highway boards.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. It was the general opinion or the conviction of our committee that it was more appropriate for the State highway commissions who are especially equipped and organized for the building of roads with their engineering departments, and so forth, than county organizations, which could not be compared to them in organization, equipment, and set-up.

Mr. TARVER. County organizations, of course, have the proper facilities with which they do construct and have been constructing farm-to-market roads throughout the years.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. To a certain extent that may be true.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If I may be permitted, I may say in further response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia that amendment no. 8 was inserted in the Senate. It required the Bureau of Public Roads to deal directly with the county road commissions in the various counties in the States.

Mr. TARVER. It did not require it; it permitted it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Its purpose was for the Bureau of Public Roads to have contact directly with the county authorities. There was an amendment in the House bill for the establishing of a section of rural roads. That is amendment no. 9. Personally, I favor retaining amendment no. 9 as it passed the House. The conferees struck out both these amendments on the theory that it would be most expensive and unnecessary for the Bureau of Public Roads to establish provision for contacting about 3,000 agencies in the United States when, as a matter of fact, some of the roads would be under the supervision of the highway commission. It was thought to be a better policy to provide that the spokesman for the State—that is, the State highway commission, in all Federal-aid funds, should be the spokesman for the various county commissions in the States. There has been established in the Bureau of Public Roads, moreover, a division for the preparation of plans for secondary roads, and it was thought that the matter could be handled a great deal more efficiently by eliminating the provision that was inserted by the House inasmuch as a division of secondary roads, or county roads, had been set up in the Bureau and had permitted the contacts to be made by the State highway commissions representing the various county commissions.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his further explanation.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whittington] such time as he may need.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I should like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question. I think this perhaps is a good bill; it is at least so far as I am concerned; but the gentleman will remember that 3 years ago several of us made a very heroic and successful effort for a line of demarcation between the country roads, the rural roads, and the mail roads.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I recall that, and I am in favor of it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the language of this bill states that the sums herein authorized shall be applied to secondary or feeder roads. What does this mean? Does this mean that all amounts provided in this bill shall be applied to these roads, or to what does it refer?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Answering the gentleman's inquiry, I may say that his inquiry relates only to the \$25,000,000 authorized by section 7 for secondary roads. The amount is not in conference. The only thing in section 7 that is in conference that is embraced in the colloquy here is the amendments 8 and 9. The amendment no. 8, in the language of the amendment, temporarily, during the 2 fiscal years 1936 and 1937, gives the Secretary of Agriculture in his discretion authority to deal directly with county road authorities. It was intended primarily to apply to one or perhaps two States; and, inasmuch as there was nothing compulsory about requirement, and inasmuch as we were advised that a division of roads had been set up in the Bureau of Roads, both the amendments 8 and 9, we were advised, were unnecessary.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it not true amendment no. 8 was inserted there to take care of amendment no. 9?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No. Amendment no. 8 is the Senate amendment and amendment no. 9 is the House amendment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman this question, which perhaps has nothing to do with the conference report, but did the conferees apportion the amount appropriated as between country roads and other roads? In other words, what percentage is involved? It seems as if it makes about 25 percent of the appropriation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is the same relative amount that has been carried in emergency appropriations for secondary roads, and we have brought forward the same ratio. The ratio for secondary roads has been from about one-fourth to one-fifth, and it is one-fifth in the pending bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It is provided by amendment no. 8 that the Federal Highway Department may have something to do with reference to where improvements shall be made on country roads.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Amendment no. 8 was stricken out in conference. The Federal Highway Department, as the gentleman terms it, or the Bureau of Roads, has to approve all of these roads, both primary and secondary. We feel that with the Division of Rural Roads the then Bureau of Roads, the rural roads will be amply provided for.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman does not mean that amendment no. 8 has been stricken out. Amendment no. 8 has been added, page 7.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That was added in the Senate and stricken out in conference.

Under leave granted to revise and extend my remarks on the conference report I call attention to the fact that the bill as agreed to by the conferees is fully set forth in the conference report and statement of managers, carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, June 1. A brief analysis of the bill will serve to show the differences in the act as it passed the House, as it passed the Senate, and as it was agreed to by the conferees.

The conferees agreed to an amendment to section 1 and inserted paragraph (d). It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may eliminate the requirement for matching Federal aid in the case of any State where he finds that all special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation are applied to highway purposes. The amendment is limited to the fiscal years 1936 and 1937. It does not require any additional appropriation. It does require that all gas and other taxes be applied to road purposes.

Personally, as I stated at the time the bill passed the House, I thought the amendment unwise. I agreed to the conference report because a majority of the conferees supported the amendment.

The conferees agreed to increase the authorization for forest highways, roads, and trails from \$10,000,000 to \$14,000,000. The authorization for forest highways has been carried in preceding highway acts. Under the act of June 18, 1934, the authorization was \$10,000,000. It is not new legislation. Similar authorizations have previously obtained. Personally I favored the amount of \$10,000,000. The Senate increased the amount to \$20,000,000. They met the House more than halfway and the amount was agreed to in conference as \$14,000,000.

The other amendments to section 3 are to provide for more efficient expenditures and to provide that contracts for forest highways shall be on a parity so far as obligations are concerned on the part of the Federal Government with contracts for Federal-aid highways.

Sections 3 and 4 were not in dispute and the authorization for roads through public lands, Indian lands, and the authorization for roads through national parks remain, the aggregate of these two amounts being \$10,000,000.

Section 6 provides for an authorization of \$4,000,000 for roads through Indian lands. I opposed this authorization in the House and in the conference on the ground that there was an authorization already in existence under the act of May 26, 1928. It is fair to say, however, that a similar authorization obtained in the act of June 18, 1934, known as the Hayden-Cartwright Act, and in previous appropriations.

Section 5 provides for an authorization of \$10,000,000 for each of the 2 fiscal years mentioned for the construction and maintenance of parkways to give access to national parks or to become connecting sections of a national parkway plan. I favored the provision and announced when the bill was under consideration in the House that I reserved the right to support this provision. It is an authorization primarily for the construction of the Natchez Trace Parkway in the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee, with a total length of 460 miles, and for the Blue Ridge Parkway in the States of North Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee, with a total length of 490 miles. Provision has previously been made for both the Natchez Trace and Blue Ridge Parkways by the President out of an allocation for the Relief and Emergency Act of 1935 and out of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933. The work is already in progress on both of the parkways. The Blue Ridge Park connects the Shenandoah and Great Smoky National Parks. Provision will be made in the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways for about 900 miles of highways.

As I have stated, practically all of the national parks are west of the Mississippi River. Substantially 900 or 1,000 miles of park highways have been constructed west of the Mississippi River. The pending bill carries \$7,500,000 for roads in parks; it carries \$2,500,000 for roads through public lands; it carries \$4,000,000 for roads through Indian lands. These amounts aggregate \$14,000,000. In addition, the pending bill carries \$14,000,000 for forest highways, roads, and trails. National forests have been largely increased in the last 3 or 4 years, but the fact is most of the forests are west of the Mississippi River. While provision is thus made for the expenditure of \$28,000,000, largely west of the Mississippi River, the provision for an expenditure of \$10,000,000 on parkways east of the Mississippi River is not unreasonable. The fact is the authorizations are substantially on all fours. The aggregate of \$28,000,000 for parks, forests, public lands, and Indian lands has obtained in previous highway legislation. An especially generous provision has been made for these improvements under the emergency acts.

The conferees eliminated the amendment to section 7 of the act giving the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, authority to deal directly with counties or other subdivisions of the several States respecting the construction of secondary roads. The conferees also eliminated the provision requiring a section of rural roads to be established in the Bureau of Public Roads. The Director of the Bureau of Public Roads assured the conferees that there was a division of rural roads and there was no occasion for the expense incident to the establishment of a separate section of rural roads.

The State highway commissioners are the spokesmen for States with respect to Federal aid for highways. The authorities in the counties and other subdivisions can better contact the State highway commission than they can the Secretary of Agriculture. Either the States or the counties or road districts must provide for matching Federal aid for secondary roads.

The only argument in behalf of the provision requiring the enormous expenditure of setting up additional agencies to deal with more than 3,000 counties was by one or two States where some were not satisfied with the work of the State highway commissions. The answer is that the State highway commissioners are selected by the State; the State has some rights. If a mistake has been made, the State should correct the mistake. The remedy is not to multiply Federal agencies and increase Federal bureaucracy. Surely the highway commission will give as much consideration to the counties and legal subdivisions as to a bureau in Washington. Moreover, even if the amendment had been retained, the probability is the Secretary of Agriculture would not have exercised the discretion.

All Federal-aid projects, including Federal-aid highways and secondary roads, will have to be approved by the

Director of Public Roads. If the Secretary of Agriculture were given authority to deal direct with local boards, this might indirectly deprive the State highway commission of its privilege of representing the State in the location and selection of the highways.

The amendment proposed by the Senate and agreed to in conference with respect to proper protective safety devices in section 7 embraces no new matter. The conferees were advised that the expenditure of funds allocated under the Relief and Emergency Act had been made upon the conditions proposed. The amendment merely carries forward the policy that now obtains with respect to authority for the elimination of grade crossings.

Amendment 14 is a very important one. In post-exchange stores and on Government reservations gasoline and motor-vehicle fuel is being sold free from local taxes. The conferees believe that all local taxes should be collected except when the gasoline or motor-vehicle fuels are for the exclusive use of the United States. The privilege should not be extended to officials or employees when not in the actual discharge of their official duties. The conferees agreed, therefore, to provide for the collection of all taxes levied by any State, Territory, or District upon the sale of gasoline or other motor-vehicle fuel, except when for the exclusive use of the United States.

The needs for highway constructions are multiplying. The conference report should be approved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT] yield to me for a question?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. A few minutes ago, I asked the chairman of the Committee on Roads about section 5. I asked the chairman particularly to advise the House the amount carried in this bill for farm-to-market roads as compared with the amount for grade crossings. His response was that \$25,000,000 is provided in section 5 for farm-to-market roads. In another section there is provided \$50,000,000 for the elimination of highway grade crossings. Was it the consensus of opinion of the members of the Committee on Roads that the elimination of highway grade crossings was twice as important as the building of farm-to-market roads? Permit me to add that I am especially interested in a farm-to-market road program, as my colleague well knows. I am also interested in eliminating dangerous highway grade crossings, but it occurs to me that the items in this bill should be reversed, giving \$50,000,000 for a farm-to-market road program, and \$25,000,000 for the elimination of highway grade crossings.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I deeply appreciate my colleague's interest in farm-to-market roads which he has always shown. But, as I stated before, the farm-to-market roads get much more from other sources. Anyway, this was settled in the passage of the bill, therefore is not involved in the conference.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, there were two or three things in this conference which were really controversial. The first was that the House committee, when considering this bill, reduced the sum in section 2 to be appropriated for forest highway road trails from \$15,000,000 to \$10,000,000. We felt that was all that was required. The Senate amended the House bill and provided that \$20,000,000 should be appropriated for this purpose. The conferees agreed upon \$14,000,000, which is \$1,000,000 less than the Bureau asked for.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that this year the bill which has just been approved for the Agricultural Department carries \$8,000,000?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am not sure, but I am willing to take the gentleman's word for it.

Mr. TABER. That is the fact.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that \$14,000,000 is not required for this purpose and that the amount which we originally appropriated of \$10,000,000 is adequate. Inasmuch as the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee has stated we have appropriated \$8,000,000, which was undoubtedly done as the result of hearings and at the request of the Bureau, we feel that is sufficient.

I hope it will be borne in mind during the consideration of this conference report that with the exception of amendment no. 9 the House receded on every amendment the Senate wrote into this bill. I want to particularly address myself at this time to amendment no. 5.

Mr. Speaker, if this amendment is agreed to, the Members of the House will go on record as approving the most visionary project that has ever been conceived in the mind of any man. This section, as written into the bill by the Senate, provides there shall be appropriated or authorized as an appropriation \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, for the construction and maintenance of parkways to give access to national parks and national monuments, or to become connecting sections of a national-parkway plan.

The reason for this section, and the only thing behind it, is a bill which is now pending before this House to authorize the construction of a parkway 800 feet wide, except where it goes through Government forest lands, and then it is to be 200 feet wide, and 477 miles long between the Smoky Mountains National Park and the Shenandoah National Park. If you can contemplate driving over a parkway 800 feet wide seven-eighths of the distance between the Capital City of Washington and the city of Detroit, you have some idea as to what we are doing in accepting Senate amendment no. 5 to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this \$10,000,000 is merely a starter. In fact, it started before the Senate wrote this amendment into the bill. The President authorized an allotment of over a million dollars to this project, and over a million dollars to a comparable project, the Natchez Trace, running across the State of Mississippi, without any authority from this Congress, and without any authority from this House. The President on his own initiative allocated over a million dollars to each of these projects. Now they come in here and want us to put our stamp of approval on a proposition of that kind.

Mr. Speaker, what does this mean? It means that this great superhighway, 800 feet wide and 477 miles long, connecting the great Smoky Mountains National Park and the Shenandoah National Park, will ultimately cost the taxpayers of this Nation \$23,500,000.

Also, it would authorize the construction of the Natchez Trace across the State of Mississippi, a survey for which was authorized by the Congress last year, with the idea that the findings would be reported back here and we would have further opportunity to be heard on the feasibility of spending the money for this purpose, which is to cost \$25,000,000, and the only justification for it is that it is the route which Jackson took when he marched his army down to take New Orleans. It is a very interesting country and is a very interesting story historically, but it is going to cost us \$25,000,000 to give the State of Mississippi a free highway across the State without having to match the appropriation with one dollar of State money.

This other parkway gives the States of Virginia and North Carolina a parkway 477 miles long, including a highway, without the States of Virginia and North Carolina having to match one cent of it.

The Members should know what they are doing when they are voting for amendment 5. You have called Passamaquoddy visionary, you have called the Florida ship canal visionary, you have not known what visionary projects are until you have made a study of the potentialities of amendment no. 5, and I am asking the House to use the logic which it ordinarily uses in these cases and vote down the conference report in order that we may have a separate vote upon

whether we shall recede and concur in Senate amendment no. 5 or not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD].

Mr. LORD. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Roads spent considerable time on this road bill and when we sent the bill to the Senate it was a good measure. We eliminated from the bill the various provisions that have been put back in it by the Senate. The provision that the gentleman from Michigan has just spoken about to construct nearly 1,000 miles of superhighway in four or five Southern States that is to be from 200- to 800-foot right-of-way was eliminated from the bill while it was before the House committee.

Another provision which we eliminated, but which has been now added to the bill at page 6, provides that one particular State of the Union may receive Federal aid without matching such amounts. It has always been, and is now the law, that each State that receives Federal aid shall contribute a similar amount. If we pass the bill with this provision in it, any State in the future may put itself in a position where they will not have to match Federal aid in order to get Federal money. This is amendment no. 1 in the bill and applies particularly to the State of Arkansas.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has stated the objections to the other principal amendments, in all of which I concur.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], in opposing amendment no. 5 of this bill, takes particular pains to inveigh against the building of the Blue Ridge Parkway, connecting the Great Smoky Mountain National Park and the Shenandoah National Park, comprising 427,000 acres in North Carolina and Tennessee and 180,000 acres in the State of Virginia. The gentleman referred to another bill, to which he objected yesterday, which he states authorizes the construction of this parkway, showing how little the gentleman knows about the subject. That bill authorizes nothing of the kind. It only authorizes the administration and maintenance of this parkway over the public lands of the United States and does not have a word or syllable in it so far as authorizing the parkway is concerned. The parkway is being constructed under title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, which the gentleman would know if he would look into the matter.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This amendment provides \$10,000 for each of the next 2 years, and the Senate committee hearing bears out the fact that the Government is to spend \$23,500,000 on the gentleman's project and \$25,000,000 upon the project at Natchez Trace. I would advise the gentleman to read the hearings. When he states I do not know anything about the bill, I may say that I have read them, and I have been very careful in stating the facts correctly. Although the States furnish this land, the maintenance of the parkway after it is donated to the Federal Government will be maintained under the appropriation provided in this amendment.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The States of North Carolina and Tennessee have deeded or ceded to the Federal Government for park purposes the 427,000 acres of land in North Carolina and Tennessee and 180,000 acres in Virginia as a gift. This park land cost the States of North Carolina and Virginia \$12,000,000, and I do not know how much it cost Tennessee, and this parkway is being built to connect these two great national parks and will be the property of the United States and will be maintained the same as the other national parks.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have not authorized them to accept the land for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This was authorized under the National Industrial Recovery Act.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That was the purpose of the bill we killed on the floor yesterday.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The parkway is already under construction. About 100 miles has already been let to contract

and quite a part of it has already been constructed. The bill objected to yesterday relates only to the maintenance of the parkway and not to any authorization for the building of the roads.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it my understanding, then, that when this fantastic project is finished you will have 200,000 or 300,000 acres in Virginia and 400,000 acres in North Carolina and a parkway 477 miles long connecting these two parks, which will be 800 feet wide?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; that is just another sample of the imagination of the gentleman from Ohio. It will be about 40 feet wide in some places and 26 feet wide in others. No 800-foot parkway is proposed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman knows better than that.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman does not know better than that. I do not yield further to the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman has made a misstatement, but, of course, not intentionally.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In what respect?

Mr. DOUGHTON. About the parkway being 800 feet wide.

Mr. WOLCOTT. All right; we will refer to the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The bill provides for an easement of 800 feet—

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman had better read his bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman not only does not confine himself to the facts, but he does not obey the rules of the House. The gentleman is so confused and so bewildered that he violates the rules of the House. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan use the rest of his time now?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes. Now, does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] dispute the fact that in the bill we had under consideration yesterday he provides that this parkway is to be 800 feet wide, except where it goes through Federal forest lands, and then to a maximum of 200 feet wide?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I deny I provide for anything. It is not my bill. The gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Has not the gentleman got his name on the bill that we had under consideration yesterday?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That provides for the maintenance, not the construction.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It provides for this parkway, and the money for that is to be appropriated under section 5 of this bill; the gentleman must know that if he knows what he is talking about. If the gentleman will look at the bill that he presented to us for consideration yesterday he will see that on the deeding of this land for that right-of-way 800 feet wide, except where it goes through Federal forest lands, and then 200 feet wide, that then the Government is to maintain it out of this \$48,000,000. The gentleman ought to read his own bill if he does not know anything about it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman has no business talking about bills that he does not know anything about.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman says he did not say that yesterday, but if he will be patient for a minute I will read the bill to him and prove that he does not know what is in his own bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in considering bills of this kind we must realize that sometime the United States of America has got to come to the point where it ceases to increase the amount it appropriates instead of continually increasing it. In this bill Senate amendment no. 1 is so drawn that it can permit the Secretary of Agriculture, regardless of whether they have any legitimate gasoline taxes or not, to allocate a lot of money to supplement what they refused to raise by gasoline tax, just like the

District of Columbia refuses to do. On page 4 there is a provision which increases the amount that the House allowed for the purpose of forest highways from \$10,000,000 to \$14,000,000 and yet this year we are appropriating only \$8,000,000. It seems to me ridiculous.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true—and the gentleman knows that I have opposed the increase—and is it not fair to say that the act of 1934 provides appropriations of comparable amounts for the same purpose?

Mr. TABER. I do not know about that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I know it is true.

Mr. TABER. I know it is \$8,000,000 for 1937, and this increases the authorized amount to \$14,000,000, and I do not like it. Then there is this parkway that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has told us about. I do not know how much it will cost, but I guarantee it will cost, if you go on on this colossal scale, from \$35,000,000 to \$40,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to the parkway—

Mr. TABER. How much will it cost?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All the money heretofore expended for parks has been largely expended west of the Mississippi, and this will provide for spending money on parks and parkways east of the Mississippi, and includes only the Shenandoah and the Natchez Trace Parkway.

Mr. TABER. This will cost \$200,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It will not. The total costs of the two parkways will be about \$45,000,000, as shown by the Senate hearings.

Mr. TABER. That is my information.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield any more. Section 6, on page 6, now takes the place of an appropriation of three and a half million dollars, and this is an authorization here for \$4,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is exactly the amount in the present law.

Mr. TABER. Three and a half million dollars is the amount carried the other day. Go over your other amendments, and the whole thing just means that we are increasing the amount authorized by a tremendous amount of money. I hope that the House will vote down the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the conference report on H. R. 11637 and to correct the impression that some of the membership of the House may have gotten from the erroneous statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. He advised the House a moment ago that this parkway would be 800 feet wide. There is nothing whatever in this law or any other law enacted by Congress that authorizes the construction of a parkway 800 feet wide. The bill referred to by the gentleman from Michigan, introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], known as H. R. 12455, provides that it shall be 200 feet wide.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not more than that?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. That is correct. Not more than 200 feet is the exact language of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman look at the report on the bill, on the bottom line of the first page? There he will find the following:

The parkway will be 477 miles long and will be located on a right-of-way averaging 800 feet in width, which is being acquired by the States involved and donated to the United States, except where the location is through national-forest areas.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. That is the right of way; that does not mean that the road will be 800 feet in width, as the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not say the cement road is 800 feet wide, but the parkway is to be 800 feet wide.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. That may be true, but the gentleman must bear in mind that the States, counties, and local communities through which the parkways run are to furnish the entire right-of-way without any cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has stated that the construction of the two parkways will cost the Federal Government \$200,000,000. The gentleman is in error when he makes such a statement. The construction of the Natchez Trace Parkway and the Blue Ridge Parkway will not cost anything near that amount. The Natchez Trace Parkway runs from Natchez, Miss., in a northeasterly direction across the State of Mississippi, then across the northwest corner of Alabama, and then to Nashville, Tenn., and covers a distance of approximately 460 miles. It is estimated by the National Park Service that it will cost \$50,000 a mile to construct this parkway, thus taking approximately \$23,000,000 for its entire construction. The Blue Ridge Parkway runs a distance of approximately 490 miles in the States of North Carolina and Virginia and connects the Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountain National Parks. It is estimated by the National Park Service that the Blue Ridge Parkway will cost approximately \$70,000 a mile, thus making the total cost of this parkway approximately \$34,300,000.

Mr. Speaker, both of these parkways are historic from many standpoints. They run through great States, and the construction of these parkways at this time would afford employment to a large number who are now unemployed. I hope that my friends will join me in voting for the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Michigan has referred to this as a fantastic proposition. I call his attention to the fact that the development of the Shenandoah and Great Smoky parks will put within a half day's motor ride of 30,000,000 people the greatest recreational area in the United States. When this scenic drive is completed, those two parks will in 1 year be visited by more people than all of the other 22 national parks in the United States combined.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In just a minute.

Already, when the drive is not built, when our Shenandoah Park has not been completed, we have had more visitors to the Shenandoah National Park than any five parks in the United States combined.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then the gentleman admits that the purpose of this bill is to build a parkway and maintain a road through that parkway 477 miles long, connecting these two parks?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely, and it is a sound proposition, to make available to the Atlantic seaboard, where you have concentration of population, this great recreational area. There those people can find surcease from the strain of our present economic life. Wildlife can be taken care of. There are free camping grounds. There is an opportunity to find healthy recreation and happiness that cannot be found in our smoke-filled cities. It is one of the soundest propositions that has ever been presented to the House.

The gasoline tax that the Government will collect from motorists using this Skyline Drive will not only provide a fund for maintenance of the highway but likewise enough to repay the capital investment. The project will bring indirect returns of a financial character by putting money in circulation. Any economist will tell you that prosperity in the country is more dependent upon the velocity of circulation than upon the amount of the circulating medium.

A few Sundays ago, accompanied by my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER], I drove over the section of the Skyline Drive in the Shenandoah National Park from Swift Run Gap to Panorama. We were struck not only with the large number of motorists on the drive but likewise with

the fact that at least 90 percent of the cars were from States other than Virginia. As I recall, the largest number was from New York. When a motorist starts from New York to visit an area of this character he puts money in circulation in all of the States through which he passes.

My distinguished colleague [Mr. Wolcott] has likewise referred to the requirement of the National Park Service of an 800-foot right-of-way for the drive in question, with a 200-foot right-of-way through property owned by the Federal Government. The metal surface of the road itself is only 30 feet wide. The Government will then acquire—and mind you every foot of it will be donated to the Government—a fee simple title to a 200-foot right-of-way. In addition to that there will be donated to the Government on each side of the right-of-way a scenic easement in an additional 400 feet for the purpose of protecting the scenic drive from unsightly roadside signs.

I, therefore, wish, Mr. Speaker, to impress upon my colleagues the fact that the Government will not spend one red cent for acquiring title to a single acre of land in either the Shenandoah National Park or the Great Smoky National Park nor for one acre of land in any of the right-of-way involved in the construction of the Skyline Drive to contact these two great parks. Everyone knows that a great natural resource is useless unless accessible. Admiral Byrd discovered some great natural resources at the South Pole, but until they are more accessible they will have no commercial value. We have great natural resources in Alaska, and the Government has been subsidizing railroads, steamship lines, and air lines to make them more accessible. When we bought Alaska it was frequently referred to as "Uncle Sam's icebox." Each year we are becoming more and more dependent upon the fisheries of Alaska, and some day we may be dependent upon the mineral resources of that vast domain.

During three seasons of the year, the spring, summer, and fall, there is a charm and beauty in the Shenandoah and Great Smoky National Parks that is not surpassed in the East. By the construction of the drive in question, we can bring within easy reach of some 30,000,000 people the scenic beauty of an Alpine drive, the best of the flora and fauna of the Middle Atlantic States, and, as I have previously indicated, an opportunity for the city dwellers to enjoy cheap and wholesome recreation. For in addition to the recreational opportunities to be offered by the two parks the drive will pass through more than 1,000,000 acres of national forests in Virginia and a large acreage in North Carolina. These national forests do not belong to Virginia and North Carolina—they belong to the Nation to be held in trust for the use and benefit of all the people. They are open to public hunting and fishing, and camping; they are open for a longer period of the year on account of climatic conditions than some of our other national parks and national forests; and lying south of north and north of south they offer not only to the sportsman but to the nature lover whose name is legion an opportunity to make contact with a wide variety of birds and animals. I hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this conference report will be adopted. In addition to providing for the enjoyment of the natural resources I have mentioned, the report likewise provides for a very necessary highway program and for the first time in the history of the Nation carries a direct appropriation for the construction of farm-to-market roads.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, there is no difference and no disagreement existing between the two Houses on this report. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] signed the report, except as to amendment no. 5.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that this bill carries \$125,000,000 for Federal aid to roads. It carries \$25,000,000 for farm-to-market roads. It carries other au-

thorizations for grade crossings, parkways, and Indian trails. If we wish to defeat this whole measure, then we should vote down the conference report, but if we are in favor of this bill, which is an infinitely better measure than when it left the House, we should vote for the adoption of the conference report.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Wolcott) there were ayes 74 and noes 34.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 87, answered "present" 1, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—238

Adair	Dobbins	Kloeb	Richards
Amle	Dockweiler	Kniffin	Richardson
Ashbrook	Dorsey	Kocialkowski	Robertson
Ayers	Doughton	Kramer	Robison, Ky.
Bankhead	Doxey	Kvale	Rogers, Okla.
Barry	Drewry	Lambeth	Romjue
Beam	Driscoll	Lamneck	Russell
Beiter	Driver	Lea, Calif.	Ryan
Bell	Duffey, Ohio	Lemke	Sabath
Biermann	Duffy, N. Y.	Lesinski	Sadowski
Bland	Dunn, Pa.	Lewis, Colo.	Sanders, Tex.
Blanton	Eckert	Lewis, Md.	Schneider, Wis.
Bloom	Edmiston	McAndrews	Schuetz
Boehne	Ellenbogen	McClellan	Schulte
Bolleau	Evans	McCormack	Scott
Boykin	Farley	McFarlane	Scrugham
Boylan	Ferguson	McGehee	Secrest
Brooks	Fiesinger	McGrath	Shanley
Brown, Ga.	Flannagan	McLaughlin	Sisson
Buchanan	Ford, Calif.	McReynolds	Smith, Conn.
Buck	Ford, Miss.	Maas	Smith, Va.
Buckler, Minn.	Frey	Mahon	Smith, W. Va.
Burch	Fuller	Maloney	Snyder, Pa.
Burdick	Fulmer	Mansfield	South
Cannon, Mo.	Gambrill	Martin, Colo.	Spence
Carmichael	Gasque	Mason	Starnes
Carter	Gassaway	Massingale	Steagall
Cartwright	Gavagan	May	Stubbs
Casey	Gearhart	Mead	Sutphin
Castellow	Gildea	Meeks	Sweeney
Chandler	Gingery	Miller	Taylor, Colo.
Citron	Goldsborough	Mitchell, Ill.	Taylor, Tenn.
Clark, Idaho	Granfield	Mitchell, Tenn.	Terry
Cochran	Greenwood	Monaghan	Thom
Coffee	Greever	Moran	Thomason
Colden	Gregory	Moritz	Thompson
Cole, Md.	Griswold	Murdock	Tolan
Colmer	Haines	Nichols	Tonry
Connery	Hamlin	Norton	Turner
Cooley	Harlan	O'Connell	Umstead
Cooper, Tenn.	Hart	O'Day	Utterback
Costello	Healey	O'Neal	Vinson, Ga.
Cox	Higgins, Mass.	Owen	Vinson, Ky.
Cravens	Hildebrandt	Palmisano	Wallgren
Creal	Hill, Ala.	Parsons	Walter
Crosby	Hill, Knute	Patman	Warren
Crosser, Ohio	Hill, Samuel B.	Patterson	Wearin
Crowe	Hobbs	Patton	Weaver
Cullen	Houston	Pearson	Werner
Cummings	Imhoff	Peterson, Ga.	West
Curley	Jacobsen	Pettengill	White
Daly	Jenckes, Ind.	Peyser	Whittington
Darden	Johnson, Okla.	Pfeifer	Williams
Delaney	Johnson, Tex.	Pierce	Wilson, La.
Dempsey	Johnson, W. Va.	Pittenger	Withrow
DeRouen	Jones	Quinn	Wood
Dickstein	Keller	Rabaut	Woodrum
Dies	Kennedy, Md.	Ramsay	Young
Dingell	Kenney	Rankin	
Disney	Kleberg	Reece	

NAYS—87

Allen	Blackney	Church	Culkin
Andresen	Burnham	Cole, N. Y.	Deen
Arends	Carlson	Collins	Dirksen
Bacharach	Carpenter	Cooper, Ohio	Dondero
Bacon	Cavichia	Crawford	Elcher
Binderup	Christianson	Crowther	Ekwall

Engel	Kelly	Mott	Taber
Fish	Kinzer	O'Brien	Tarver
Fletcher	Knutson	Polk	Taylor, S. C.
Focht	Lambertson	Powers	Thurston
Gehrmann	Larrabee	Ramspeck	Tinkham
Gifford	Lehlbach	Ransley	Tobey
Gilchrist	Lord	Reed, Ill.	Treadway
Goodwin	Luckey	Reed, N. Y.	Wadsworth
Gray, Ind.	Ludlow	Reilly	Whelchel
Guyer	McKeough	Risk	Wigglesworth
Hancock, N. Y.	Main	Rogers, Mass.	Wilson, Pa.
Hess	Mapes	Sauthoff	Wolcott
Hoffman	Marshall	Seger	Wolfenden
Holmes	Merritt, Conn.	Short	Wolverton
Hull	Michener	Snell	Woodruff
Jenkins, Ohio	Millard	Stefan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Smith, Wash.

NOT VOTING—99

Andrew, Mass.	Duncan	Kahn	Parks
Andrews, N. Y.	Dunn, Miss.	Kee	Peterson, Fla.
Barden	Eagle	Kennedy, N. Y.	Plumley
Berlin	Eaton	Kerr	Randolph
Boland	Englebright	Kopplemann	Rayburn
Bolton	Faddis	Lanham	Rich
Brennan	Fenerty	Lee, Okla.	Robinson, Utah
Brewster	Fernandez	Lucas	Rogers, N. H.
Brown, Mich.	Fitzpatrick	Lundeen	Sanders, La.
Buckley, N. Y.	Gillette	McGroarty	Sandlin
Bulwinkle	Gray, Pa.	McLean	Schaefer
Caldwell	Green	McLeod	Sears
Cannon, Wis.	Greenway	McMillan	Shannon
Cary	Gwynne	McSwain	Sirovich
Celler	Halleck	Marcantonio	Somers, N. Y.
Chapman	Hancock, N. C.	Martin, Mass.	Stack
Claborne	Harter	Maverick	Stewart
Clark, N. C.	Hartley	Merritt, N. Y.	Sullivan
Corning	Hennings	Montague	Summers, Tex.
Cross, Tex.	Higgins, Conn.	Montet	Turpin
Darrow	Hoeppe	Nelson	Welch
Dear	Hollister	O'Connor	Wilcox
Dietrich	Hook	O'Leary	Zimmerman
Ditter	Hope	Oliver	Zioncheck
Doutrich	Huddleston	O'Malley	

So the conference report was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:
On this vote:

Mr. Hancock of North Carolina (for) with Mr. Darrow (against).
Mr. Nelson (for) with Mr. Eaton (against).
Mr. Clark of North Carolina (for) with Mr. Ditter (against).
Mr. Barden (for) with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut (against).
Mr. Lundeen (for) with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts (against).
Mr. Robinson of Utah (for) with Mr. Hollister (against).
Mr. Boland (for) with Mr. Gwynne (against).
Mr. Fernandez (for) with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts (against).
Mr. McMillan (for) with Mr. McLeod (against).
Mr. Merritt of New York (for) with Mr. Hartley (against).
Mr. Bulwinkle (for) with Mr. Stewart (against).
Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Bolton (against).
Mr. Cary (for) with Mr. McLean (against).
Mr. O'Leary (for) with Mr. Plumley (against).
Mr. Hook (for) with Mr. Rich (against).
Mr. Fitzpatrick (for) with Mr. Halleck (against).
Mr. Kee (for) with Mr. Hope (against).
Mr. Somers of New York (for) with Mr. Doutrich (against).
Mr. Hennings (for) with Mr. Andrews of New York (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Corning with Mr. Brewster.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. Sears with Mrs. Kahn.
Mr. Green with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Wilcox with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Dietrich.
Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Berlin.
Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania with Mr. Harter.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Lucas.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Maverick.
Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Faddis.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Brennan.
Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mrs. Greenway.
Mr. O'Malley with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Claborne.
Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Montet.
Mr. Stack with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Sandlin with Mr. Randolph.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Dear.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire.
Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Cross of Texas.
Mr. Parks with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Eagle with Mr. McGroarty.

Mr. PETTENGILL changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

LXXX—550

On motion by Mr. CARTWRIGHT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

CONTESTED ELECTION—LINCOLN LOY M'CANDLESS v. SAMUEL WILDER KING

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Elections No. 2, I call upon a privileged resolution, House Resolution 521.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 521

Resolved, That Lincoln Loy McCandless was not elected a Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii to the House of Representatives at the general election held November 6, 1934; and

Resolved, That SAMUEL WILDER KING was elected a Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii to the House of Representatives at the general election held on November 6, 1934, and is entitled to his seat.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point to include some correspondence I have had about the matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, for many reasons the bill which has just passed for Federal aid to highways is one of vital importance, and it has been a real pleasure for me to actively support its enactment into law.

Authorization is made in this bill for the appropriation of \$125,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1938 and 1939 for Federal aid to States for highway construction, and \$25,000,000 per year for 1938 and 1939 is likewise provided for use exclusively in construction of farm-to-market roads.

The importance of farm-to-market roads is everywhere recognized. That our main highways must be constructed is beyond question, but we must not lose sight of the widespread, imperative necessity for improved rural roads. The farmer is entitled to a good road over which to carry his products to market, over which to send his children to school, and over which to travel at any time for any other purposes. Improved farm-to-market roads will mean much in the future of farm progress, and this bill certainly marks a decisive step in the right direction.

I am truly interested in making these benefits available to our people, but I also wish to direct your attention to section 5 of the bill as amended. This section carries an authorization for the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for each of the years 1938 and 1939 for the construction of national parkways, including the Natchez Trace Parkway from Natchez, Miss., to Nashville, Tenn.

Mr. A. E. Demaray, Acting Director of the National Park Service, has kindly written me the following letter, which shows that \$9,153,685 is to be made available by section 5 of this bill for the construction of the Natchez Trace Parkway in the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee, and the sum of \$10,846,315 is made available for construction of the Blue Ridge Parkway in the States of North Carolina and Virginia:

WASHINGTON, May 12, 1936.

Hon. A. L. FORD,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FORD: In compliance with your request of May 9, a table was included in the National Park Service testimony before the Senate Post Offices and Post Roads Committee indicating a division of funds between the two national parkway projects now under construction. On the basis of the Senate amendment to

the Federal road bill, the division of the \$10,000,000 annual authorization contained in section 5 of H. R. 11687 for parkway construction for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1938, and June 30, 1939, would be as follows:

Name and location of parkway	Total length (miles)	Estimated cost per mile	Estimated mileage and cost of proposed work			
			1938: \$10,000,000 authorization		1939: \$10,000,000 authorization	
			Miles	Cost	Miles	Cost
Natchez Trace	460	\$50,000				
Mississippi			60.5	\$3,026,316	67.4	\$3,368,421
Alabama			4.7	236,842	6.3	315,790
Tennessee			20.2	1,048,421	23.2	1,157,895
Total			85.4	4,311,579	96.9	4,842,106
Blue Ridge	490	70,000				
Virginia			32.9	2,305,790	34.6	2,421,052
North Carolina			48.3	3,382,631	39.1	2,736,842
Total			81.2	5,688,421	73.7	5,157,894
Grand total	950		166.6	10,000,000	170.6	10,000,000

Sincerely yours,

A. E. DEMARAY,
Acting Director, National Park Service.

The construction of a paved roadway along the historic old Indian trail running 460 miles from Natchez to Nashville is a matter of real importance to the people of my district as well as of similar interest to all those who live anywhere along the route.

On February 20, 1934, Senator Hubert D. Stephens, who was then a United States Senator from Mississippi, introduced a bill (S. 2825) authorizing the appropriation of \$50,000 for a survey of the Natchez Trace, and this bill, after passing both the Senate and the House, became a law on May 21, 1934. I found, however, when I came to Congress, over 7 months later, that the survey work for which the Senator's bill had provided had not been begun. In keeping with my official obligation to the people interested in the construction of the parkway, and because of my own personal interest in behalf of this great undertaking, I was happy to take steps immediately to secure early action. After numerous conferences with officials of the Bureau of Public Roads and of the National Park Service, the survey was actually begun in February 1935, with Engineer F. L. Brownell, of the Bureau of Public Roads, in charge.

After the survey work was assured I received the following comments in letters from the persons whose names are signed:

NATCHEZ, MISS., March 17, 1935.

We are very deeply grateful to you for introducing the bill for the paving of the Natchez Trace, and we are equally grateful for your efforts to get the survey started.

Mrs. FERRIDAY BYRNES,
President, the Natchez Trace Association.

The Natchez Trace Association greatly appreciates the splendid work which you have done in our behalf in getting the Natchez Trace advanced to its present status.

RALPH L. LANDRUM,
Secretary-Treasurer, the Natchez Trace Association.

Mr. Speaker, I have a large number of similar letters on file in my office from people in various counties through which the Natchez Trace runs.

In the meantime, on February 6, 1936, I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, H. R. 5436, authorizing the appropriation of \$25,000,000 for the construction and maintenance of the Natchez Trace Parkway, the construction to be effected along the route to be determined by the survey just being started at the time of the introduction of the bill. Congressman DAN R. McGEHEE, of Mississippi, introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives, and Senator HARRISON introduced a bill for the same purpose in the Senate.

In the House my bill went to the Committee on Roads, the same committee that approved and reported the bill which we passed a few minutes ago, containing the authorization

of \$20,000,000 for national parkway construction. I am happy to see this permanent legislation bearing the same effect as proposed in my bill.

The work of the preliminary survey begun in February was completed early in June, and I began a movement for the allocation of some funds from the \$4,880,000,000 works relief appropriation for construction of the Natchez Trace.

When Congress reached adjournment of the session on August 26, the desired allotment had not been secured, although wonderful progress in that direction had been achieved. I was anxious to get home, but I delayed my return to the district because of plans I had made in regard to additional attempts to secure the funds so much desired. At the time I left for home the outlook for securing the funds for the construction of the Natchez Trace Parkway appeared very bright, indeed. I went all over the district, seeing the people and giving them the opportunity to personally discuss with me any matter of importance to them with which I could be of any assistance. After I had visited in every county, I returned to Washington to continue my efforts in behalf of the Natchez Trace and other projects to be paid for with money taken from the \$4,880,000,000 works-relief funds.

Success came, Mr. Speaker, on November 20. Just before leaving on a vacation trip to Warm Springs, Ga., the President of the United States directed that \$150,000 be set aside for further survey work preparatory to the construction of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and he also directed that \$1,350,000 be allotted for actual construction between Natchez and Tupelo, Miss. This money is still available, and will remain available until entirely expended on the Natchez Trace.

At this point I express my thanks, and the thanks of my people, to every member of the Mississippi delegation in this House and to our United States Senators for their generous assistance in behalf of the construction of this parkway. I would not forget to thank our distinguished Speaker and the other Members of the House who have so willingly contributed to the success of this cause.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD letters I have received from the Speaker of the House and a member of the Committee on Roads.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 23, 1936.

Hon. A. L. FORD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Acknowledging your letter of recent date, I am very happy to bear testimony to your valuable work and assistance in securing an appropriation for the Natchez Trace, in which I am also interested, because it originates in my home city.

You have been active in this matter from the beginning of your service, and I am sure it is very pleasing to you that the work is bearing fruit.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely your friend,

JOSEPH W. BYRNES,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 2, 1936.

Hon. A. L. FORD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FORD: The conference report has been submitted on H. R. 11687, to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act, etc. It shows an agreement on amendment no. 5, placed in the bill in the Senate, which authorizes \$10,000,000 annually for 2 years for the construction and maintenance of parkways to give access to national parks and national monuments over lands to which title has been transferred to the United States. I am confident that the House will adopt the conference report by a large majority.

This parkway amendment will provide funds for the construction of the parkway on the Natchez Trace, and several million dollars will be allocated to this work. As one of the conferees, I wish you to know how deeply I appreciate the invaluable aid and interest that you have shown in this item. You have been most active in presenting this matter from the time that it was inserted in the bill in the Senate, and this satisfactory conclusion I am sure is most pleasing to you.

With all good wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
First District of North Carolina.

Including the amount provided in this bill and the amount set aside by order of the President, the sum of \$10,653,685

has been definitely authorized for the Natchez Trace since I came to Congress on January 1, 1935.

I am delighted that the efforts in behalf of this important roadway have been so successful. Success now makes all the hard work which was done seem very light, for it will be a happy privilege to go back to my people and tell them that they are certain to have a beautiful paved road along the Natchez Trace.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew the request I made yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose until after the special orders are disposed of.

Under the special order heretofore made by the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] for 15 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall present, without personal prejudice and without malice and without personal grudges against any group in these United States but as a Member of this body, a matter which I think it my duty to present in a calm and dispassionate way and without personal animosity.

I am addressing myself in behalf of a resolution to investigate the Black Legion and other domestic subversive movements in the United States. I am presenting this matter so that the House may pass upon it. The responsibility is not mine but that of this House of the Congress of the United States as to whether that resolution will be adopted before adjournment or not.

In 1933 the House created a committee to investigate foreign and domestic subversive agitation and movements in the United States originating abroad. That committee had for its chairman the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the Members will agree with me when I say that committee was responsible for destroying much foreign propaganda within the United States. As a result of that committee's activities, not only were we able to deport many aliens who were advocating foreign movements in this country, but we exposed a lot of foreign subsidized propaganda within our borders.

However, we are faced now with a greater responsibility—that is what to do about the recent exposure of what is known as the "Black Legion."

Mr. Speaker, it is a real menace. It has spread through 11 States, and statements have even been made to the effect that it had extended operations into 15 States. It started as a racketeering group and then developed into a political machine making attacks upon certain Members of Congress and certain people in Washington. It spread so fast that it is almost impossible to keep up with them.

Members of Congress have asked why cannot the Department of Justice take care of the situation? The Department of Justice cannot take care of it because, in the first place, Mr. Speaker, today the investigator in Michigan is investigating the investigator and even a part of the police department are members of the organization; and in the second place, a certain number of fine people in Michigan, including a certain judge or two, are involved in the outfit. It has spread, as I said, into 11 States of the Union and they claim a national membership of 6,000,000, although I do not credit them with such a large membership.

What can the Department of Justice do? Make an investigation, and then what? There is not a Federal law upon which they can prosecute so as to destroy this menace, whether it is black, white, green, brown, or blue.

Oh, I know. Some Members of Congress perhaps resent my getting on this floor because I happen to be of Jewish faith, but I still claim to be an American, just as good as they are, and I want to see that everything that is done shall be done for the welfare of all the people of my country. [Applause.]

This resolution is not directed against one particular group. I warn this Congress now that it is about time we put the searchlight upon every organization in this country that is taking the law into their own hands and seeking to destroy the foundations of this Republic.

Is it serious? It is very serious when you find men in the Reserve Corps of the United States Army, who are officers in the State Militia of Michigan, directing this group. When you find they take cavalry horses from the State troops and Army to use in their night riding, I say it is serious.

The origin of the Black Legion can be definitely traced to correspondence between "John Doe", an officer in the Reserve forces of the United States Army, a Medical Corps officer attached to the National Guard of the State of Michigan. I do not wish to give his name now but I am going to present original documents to the Committee on Rules at the proper time. This correspondence was carried on with the Silver Legion, another so-called patriotic organization with headquarters in Asheville, N. C., and in Oklahoma City, Okla. The intention at that time was to enlarge the scope of the activities of the Ku Klux Klan in Detroit and begin a sort of superklan which eventually became the Black Legion which is now operating in 11 States.

Capt. "John Doe" is now in the Reserve Corps of the United States Army, a high-ranking medical officer in the State militia of Michigan, attached to a cavalry unit of that organization, and the trainer of the night-riding Black Legion. His correspondence with officials at the headquarters of the Silver Legion—William Dudley Pelley; Harry F. Sieber; Maj. L. L. Powell, chief of staff; and Capt. Robert Summerville—reveals a direct hook-up between the Ku Klux Klan, Colonel Hadley's Paul Reveres, Silver Shirts, and the Black Legion. I am going to present this correspondence to the Committee on Rules.

Now, listen to this, my friends. Capt. "John Doe", in writing to Robert Summerville, of the Silver Legion, on October 20, 1933—that is just the time this organization was created—has this to say:

The Klan is growing with unbelievable rapidity. Inside of a month I predict a membership of 50,000. I am working very closely with them. I wish it was so that you could send an organizer here to work full time. My time is so taken that I do not have time to get more than 4 hours' sleep a night. Hope to have 50 klansmen mounted in 2 weeks' time.

The same Capt. "John Doe" wrote several other letters in which—and there is no question of doubt about it and no Member of this House can contradict it—this same Capt. "John Doe", who is a responsible officer, said he had contacted a number of other officers in the Army and had approached them upon the question of joining this movement. He has gone so far as to state that he is conducting classes and that he has about 20,000 or 50,000 ready to do the night riding any time the call is necessary.

In another letter that I have, without mentioning this officer's name, he told his colleagues in this black, white, blue—whatever you want to call it—organization that when the call for service came, and that it might come very soon, they expected bloodshed in Michigan. In another letter he said it had been decided that the family, especially wives and children, of every member of these particular groups should leave the State of Michigan when the bloodshed was to begin.

In another letter, this Capt. "John Doe" writes—I quote:

Training of the volunteer Klan cavalry troop continues without interruption.

Now, all that and more appears over the signature and in the handwriting of this particular Capt. "John Doe", and I am prepared to present these original documents to the Rules Committee for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I am not seeking a chairmanship, or membership, on any committee. I present the facts to the House so that the Committee on Rules may thoroughly examine them and prove to the House that this is a national menace, which is spreading throughout the country. It is stirring up a hatred, intolerance, and resorting to murder, if you please, in order to accomplish its result. Irrespective of the fact that I happen to be of the Jewish faith, I stand upon this floor today and beg of you to throw the searchlight of the Congress of the United States upon all of the "shirt" organizations—the blacks, the blue, the green, and the brown—and let us clean house of them all.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. It seems to me it does not make any difference to the Members of the House whether a Member is a Jew, Catholic, or Protestant. He is a Member of the House of Representatives, and I do not think any Member of the House should stand for murder or for the outrages mentioned by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman.

A letter dated October 24, 1933, within a month after this organization was organized, addressed to the Silver Rangers Organization in Oklahoma, reads in part as follows:

Thursday night I start the Klan cavalry instruction. Have 20 in the first class. That is all the mounts that will be available. They hope to purchase mounts. We anticipate riot duty here before long, at least early in the spring or late winter. The local papers are mentioning the formation of tribunals in connection with the N. R. A. That word chills my bone marrow. Reminds me of the Spanish Inquisition, Russian and French revolts, and now we have them proposed for this country; wonder what next? I am mailing a letter to field headquarters this morning concerning Silver Rangers unit here. Would like to join forces there. Animal instinct, to hunt with the pack, but feel that my first duty is here, although it is very discouraging at times. Succeeded in waking up the battalion commander, and now I'm going after the colonel of the regiment.

He is talking about colonels and commanders within the State Guard as the Reserves of the United States Army.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURDOCK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but do so only because I do not want to take the gentleman's time, may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] why he does not place everything he has in his possession in reference to this matter before the War Department and the Attorney General of the United States? If he will do that they will handle this thing in a proper and legal way to stop it. The War Department has control over all of the officers the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I will answer the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, to answer the question asked by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The Department of Justice has already been approached on this matter. The Attorney General has already been contacted, and has expressed the view that he does not see how the Department can enter into this case. He states that nothing has been presented which would show a Federal offense of an interstate nature, but if such evidence was presented he would be willing to enter into the case. Nevertheless let us remember that we do know these things which have been stated by the gentleman are facts and exist; that the State police of Michigan were aware of this condition last August when they arrested some of these men with guns or found guns in certain cars. But nothing was done. The Governor of the State of Michigan has known about it. It does not look as if the State police and the Governor of our State are going to do much of anything about the matter.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, still reserving the right to object, only to use my own time and not the gentleman's, I may say if this is wholly within the State of Michigan it is a State matter, and the State authorities of Michigan ought to handle it, and Congress has nothing to do with the matter. If it ever crosses the line from Michigan into another State it becomes a national matter, which the Congress should then look into, and the Attorney General of the United States would then handle it. The War Department has control over the officers whether it is wholly in Michigan, or in some other States also.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that the reason the State of Michigan, I believe, has not taken any part in this prosecution, or at least the way they ought to, is because of the fact these men have been affiliated with the Wolverine Republican Club and other Republican organizations. They have worked closely with the Republican Party in about four large counties in Michigan, and have been the backbone of the Republican Party in those four counties. For this reason they have not seen fit to interfere.

Mr. BLANTON. The State of Texas was able to handle night riders there and to break it up, and Michigan could do likewise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman referred to the use of force and violence by this organization. I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the special committee reported a bill making it a crime for anyone to knowingly and willingly—and please note those words—advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. This bill has been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and is now in the Committee on Rules. I cannot even get a hearing on the matter.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For a brief question.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] feel that every Republican believes in that bill as much as any Democrat?

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely.

Mr. SHORT. I am glad he does not agree with his colleague from Michigan that the Republican Party is the sole repository of all the rascality in this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think the gentleman meant that.

Mr. SHORT. What did he say?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, we are not going to impugn anything to a political party. The gentleman said this happened in four counties, where they were associated with a certain organization.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the matter before the House at this time is a matter of vital interest to both parties in this House, and I hold the Republicans just as much responsible as the Democrats for not throwing the searchlight upon this particular menace in our country.

Now I am talking again of the same Capt. "John Doe", with respect to another letter which he received from the Silver Shirt headquarters. I quote:

I sent a letter by air mail to Captain So-and-So from headquarters. I heartily approve of what you say with respect to the effectiveness of the Klan organization and the Paul Revere organization, paralleling Silver Shirts' work. It is the ultimate principle for which we are working, and it is testimony from all concerned that they can hold the front-line trench in Detroit until we are ready to come in with our organization (the Black Legion). However, I would make it mighty hot for the leader of the Klan in Detroit.

In another letter this Capt. "John Doe" says:

Succeeded in waking up the battalion commander, and now I'm going after the colonel of the regiment. Tonight out to talk with major of third squadron, One Hundred and Sixth Cavalry Regiment, and tip him off to a few practice mobilizations to see how quickly they can get ready for field duty in Michigan. Am springing a trial mobilization in my company. These Army officers are dumb—dumb—dumb.

Now, I want you to listen to this question. I think I read up to the point where they said they would make it hot for the Klan in Detroit for not giving credit where credit belongs:

Emphatically, Capt. "John Doe", there is no organization that is much on the firing line as we are, or working as intensely with espionage officers.

Of where? Espionage officers in the Reserves of the United States Army and men in the State armories of Michigan.

Just thing of it, American Army officers. High-ranking members of that great body of Reserve Officers in the United States Army are a part and parcel of this subversive, domestic, 104-percent superpatriot group to save this country. They say they are going to save this country and, if necessary, use bullets just as they have already demonstrated they will.

In a letter dated September 30, 1933, this same captain says:

I am in close contact with a large number of Army officers here, and am cultivating their friendship all I can. I also am planning on spending one night a week downtown learning all I can, and, as interesting material appears, I'll send it on to you. I am getting a lot of recruits.

Where is he getting the recruits? From his colleagues in the Reserves of the United States Army—from his colleagues in the State Militia of Michigan.

I may say I have this under control. I wish to be kept at the present time incognito, because I cannot, at the present time, show my hand.

Yet you want to tell me that the Department of Justice can investigate this activity. After they make an investigation what is going to happen? There is not a law now and we do not know what laws to pass to eradicate this un-American menace.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For a brief question, yes.

Mr. LESINSKI. The aliens are not involved in this?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Not one alien. It is all domestic, 110-percent stock of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity you have given me here today and I am only presenting the facts.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. It has been developed, has it not, that members of the local police departments belong to this organization and for that reason it is difficult to see how you can have the full confidence of the local police in grappling with this problem and therefore it is necessary to get outside help.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As I started off by saying, they are organized, in my opinion, in 11 States that I have proof of—not 15 States.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. KRAMER. Does the gentleman know that they are now organizing in southern California?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They are there now. They did not have to organize in southern California, because they have been there for years.

Mr. KRAMER. I have information that they are organizing in southern California now.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For a brief question; yes.

Mr. MAPES. I have not had the privilege of hearing all that the gentleman has said or all of the interruptions, but if my memory serves me correctly, I read a long telegram from the prosecuting attorney of the county of Wayne, of which the city of Detroit is the county seat, asking the Attorney General for assistance and as I understand, the request was denied.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The request was denied by the Attorney General. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it is only fair to clear up this situation. The Department of Justice has consistently taken the position that until there is a violation of a Federal law they are not justified in sending Federal authorities into a State. When I was chairman of a special committee we took up the question with the Department of Justice and

went into it very thoroughly. The position they take is that until there is a violation of a Federal law, they cannot act, and I think their position is that up to the present time there has been no violation of a Federal law shown.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to just a few more very important quotations from the correspondence of this Capt. "John Doe" which impresses me very strongly.

Under date of October 17, 1933, this Capt. "John Doe", of the Michigan State Militia, a part of the United States Army Reserves, wrote to the headquarters of the Silver Shirt organization as follows, in part:

Sunday afternoon the Klan are to hold a closed meeting and start a drive for 10,000 membership. There is no doubt but that they will succeed. Out of that number there are to be picked a number and they are to be turned over to me for military drill and training * * *

Again, under date of October 20, 1933, this Capt. "John Doe" writes to the same Silver Shirts headquarters, "I pledge myself to your cause."

In another letter he wrote:

I feel that the next Congress will be the last one. What will be our next step as Army officers? Will the Army stay with the dictator or with the people?

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that the situation is serious, when correspondence of this character passes between a Reserve officer of the United States Army on active duty with a National Guard organization and the officials of a subversive group of native Americans. I say it reveals a very serious state of affairs which Congress should investigate at once.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another phase of the present situation as developed in the current agitation in Michigan.

The public press, under dating of May 23, 1936, carried the statement that Officer Edward Johnson, of the State police, stationed at Jackson, Mich., had said the oath subscribed to by new members of the Black Legion reads, in part, as follows:

I further pledge my heart, my brain, my body, and my limbs never to betray a comrade; that I will submit to all the tortures that mankind can inflict and suffer the most horrible death, rather than reveal a single word of this my oath.

Before violating a single clause or implied pledge of this my obligation, I will pray to an avenging God and an unmerciful Devil to tear my heart out and roast it over flames of sulphur; that my head be split open and my brains be scattered over the earth; that my body be ripped open and my bowels be torn open and fed to the carrion birds; that each of my limbs be broken with stones and then cut off by inches that they may be food for the foulest of birds of the air; and, lastly, that my soul be given into torment; that my body may be submerged in molten metal and stifled in the flames of Hell; and that this punishment may be meted out to me through all eternity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not all in this subversive movement. These people have a military organization under the direction of a leader who is referred to as the commander in chief. They require members of this subversive military organization to take upon themselves a separate oath. According to the public press of May 29, 1936, this military oath of allegiance reads in part as follows:

I solemnly swear I will obey the orders of Harold Dugas, my commander in chief, and the orders of officers appointed by him.

Mr. Speaker, during the investigation conducted during the Seventy-third Congress by the special committee on un-American activities, a very great deal of evidence was submitted in such form that the committee could not possibly study all of the interlocking of these various movements under different names. But we did secure enough information to satisfy most of the committee members that almost all of these organizations were operating on the same general principle and were attempting to carry out much the same program.

Therefore, in the resolution I have introduced you will find a few of these organizations specifically named as the objects of the proposed investigation.

For the purpose of information to the Members of the House, I will, under the leave granted to revise and extend

my remarks, insert at this point of my remarks the text of House Resolution No. 527, which reads as follows:

Resolution

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a special committee, to be composed of seven members, for the purpose of conducting an investigation of (1) the extent, character, objects, and sources of revenue of the Black Legion, the Black Shirts, the Christian Party, the A. B. C. Legion, of New York, the Robert Edward Edmondson Organization, of New York City, and similar organizations which spread un-American propaganda and are engaged in un-American activities in the United States; (2) the extent and methods of diffusion within the United States and the sources of any un-American subversive propaganda that is instigated either from foreign countries or from domestic sources and which attacks the principle of the form of government guaranteed in our Constitution; (3) the source of revenue and method of distribution thereof used within the United States for the propagation of religious, racial, or subversive political prejudices contrary to the American principles; (4) and all other questions in relation thereto that would assist Congress in any necessary remedial legislation, including any necessity for amendments to the postal laws that may be required to bar the publications of these subversive organizations from the United States mails.

Such special committee, when organized, is hereby authorized to have custody for its use all the records, documents, files, and other papers which were in the possession of the special committee of the House of Representatives, which was appointed and operated pursuant to H. Res. 198, H. Res. 199, and H. Res. 424, of the Seventy-third Congress, second session.

Such special committee is authorized to request the fullest co-operation in the conduct of this investigation from the Department of Justice, the Post Office Department, and such other departments of the Government that the committee may deem necessary, including access to all files from such departments pertinent to the investigation, and use of such employees and facilities of such departments as may be advantageous to the conduct of such investigation.

That said special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books, papers, and documents, by subpoena or otherwise, and to take such testimony as it may deem necessary.

Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Speaker of the House of Representatives at the request of the chairman and shall be served by the Sergeant at Arms of the House or any person designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, or who, having been required to produce books, papers, and documents pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, fails or refuses to produce such required books, papers, and documents, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have concluded my remarks. I trust I have been able to convince the Members of the House that this is a very serious situation concerning the activities of the Black Legion, and I also trust my remarks will contribute to the adoption of this resolution by an overwhelming vote on the floor of this House when the Rules Committee reports the resolution to the House. I thank you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Perhaps the gentleman from Massachusetts saw the telegram to which I refer.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURDOCK). Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, my object in taking the floor at this time is to discuss briefly the power policies of this administration, to answer some of the criticisms that have been advanced, and to refute some of the false and misleading statements that have been made with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Let me repeat what I have said in this House before, that, measured in real benefits to the American people, the Tennessee Valley Authority is one of the greatest organizations ever connected with this or any other Government. In bringing cheap electricity to the people in that area and supplying a yardstick as a measurement for reasonable light and power rates, thereby forcing a reduction of rates to the ultimate consumers in every State in the Union, the T. V. A. is rendering a service to humanity that simply cannot be overestimated.

ELECTRICITY LIFELOOD

Electricity is the lifeblood of an advancing civilization. The lower the rates the more freely it flows, and the more freely it flows the greater are its benefits to mankind.

It is no longer to be regarded as a luxury, reserved for the fortunate few, but it has become a necessity and should be placed within the reach of all, and supplied to them at rates the people can afford to pay.

The great wealth of hydroelectric power in our navigable streams that throughout untold centuries has been running wasted to the sea is more valuable than all the gold fields, oil wells, and diamond mines the world has ever known.

It lights the home, it cooks the meals, it heats the house, pumps the water, runs the radio, washes the clothes, scrubs the floor, heats the iron, grinds the feed, and does a thousand other things to render the home cheerful and attractive and to lift from the shoulders of the housewife the endless burdens of drudgery she has borne since the beginning of time, to say nothing of its value in turning the wheels of industry, operating our transportation system, aiding commerce, and contributing to the advancement and application of science.

It is the greatest home builder of all time. It adds brilliance and luxury to the palaces of the rich and brings cheer and comfort to the cabins of the poor. It is the rightful heritage of all mankind and should be made available to and used for the benefit of all.

The hydroelectric power in our navigable streams and their tributaries is public property, national wealth, and should be used for the benefit of all the American people now living as well as the ones that are yet to come.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, in addition to promoting navigation and controlling floods, is generating electricity to be supplied to the people at rates they can afford to pay—rates based upon the cost of production and distribution.

For more than 2 years now, the T. V. A. has been selling power at wholesale to certain municipalities and cooperative associations in the district which I have the honor to represent in northeastern Mississippi, as well as in northern Alabama and southern Tennessee, while they in turn have been selling at retail to the ultimate consumers at what is called the standard T. V. A. rates. Those rates have been so reasonable and the results so gratifying that they have created a Nation-wide demand for similar developments.

The people throughout the entire country have become aroused and the demand for cheap light and power rates is now sweeping the country with such irresistible force that to argue against it is as futile and as foolish as it would be to stand upon the seashore and argue against the incoming tide.

ANSWER TO PROPAGANDIST

Yet a few paid power propagandists and high-salaried officials of useless holding companies continue their campaign of criticism, vilification, misrepresentation, and abuse, with just about as much effect as if they were attempting to control the change of the seasons or stay the march of time.

Here is a fair sample of their futile efforts. In what he calls his annual report to the stockholders, Mr. Wendell L. Wilkie, president of the Commonwealth & Southern, one of the large utility-holding companies, owning and controlling certain operating power companies throughout the country, makes this ridiculous assertion:

Whenever a citizen of Tupelo, Miss., turns on the electric switch, everybody in the United States helps to pay his electric bill.

Of course, that statement is not true. But it is a fair sample of the false and misleading propaganda with which

the Power Trust has been flooding the country for the last few years in their efforts to hamper the power program of this administration and to discredit the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Wilkie singles out Tupelo because that city was the first to secure power from the T. V. A., and has been a leader in the movement to provide reasonable light and power rates to the ultimate consumers. His criticism of Tupelo, if it contained any truth in fact, would also apply to Corinth, Iuka, Booneville, Amory, Fulton, Baldwin, Pontotoc, New Albany, Nettleton, Belmont, Tishomingo, Guntown, Sault, Shannon, Verona, Athens, Ala., Pulaski, Tenn., and all the other cities, towns, and rural communities in Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee that are now enjoying the use of cheap electric lights and power from Muscle Shoals. I say cheap, because these rates are cheap compared to what these same people were paying the Commonwealth & Southern for lights and power before the T. V. A. Act was passed, and compared to the exorbitant rates now being charged by private power companies throughout the country.

If I wished to retort in kind, I could truthfully say that whenever a citizen of the United States who is compelled to purchase his electricity from a private power company that is owned or controlled by one of these so-called holding companies, such as the Commonwealth & Southern, turns on the electric switch, he pays an extra amount, averaging two or three times that of his legitimate power bill, as tribute to the Power Trust—that gigantic octopus that sprawls over the United States, reaches its loathsome tentacles into every home, every store, every garage, every filling station, every business house, every church, every schoolhouse, and every factory that uses electric energy, and takes from them an overcharge that averages more than \$1,000,000,000 a year. [Applause.]

I will prove this statement before I close. I will cite the record and make it so clear that any schoolboy with reasonable intelligence can figure it out for himself. I will make it so plain that the Republican "brain trust" cannot misunderstand it—even with the aid of a Power Trust propagandist, such as Mr. "Windy" Wilkie, of the Commonwealth & Southern.

This program is saving for the people of this country the hydroelectric power of the Nation. It has given us a yardstick for the measurement of light and power rates to show what electricity is really worth, brought about a reduction to the present consumers of hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and for the first time in history made it possible for the people in the rural districts, the farmers of the Nation, to enjoy the use of electric energy at rates they can afford to pay.

But Mr. Wilkie, in the same report, says that—

Our operating companies in that area could lower their rates at least 25 percent below the Tennessee Valley Authority rates if they were given the same gifts from the Federal Treasury as are given to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Let us turn to the record and see what the facts are.

Let me again remind the House that in 1929, at the peak of high prices, the heyday of Hoover prosperity, the then president of the Commonwealth & Southern was drawing a salary of \$43,790 a year. The panic came on, prices went down, hungry men, women, and children crowded the streets of our towns and cities, while farmers' homes were swept away for debts, or sold to pay their taxes—yet by 1932, the very pit of the depression, in probably the darkest hours this Nation has ever seen, when the values of the stocks of the Commonwealth & Southern, as well as the stocks in all the operating companies they own or control, had sunk to the vanishing point, the salary of the president of the Commonwealth & Southern had been raised from \$43,790 a year in 1929 to \$130,140 a year in 1932.

The people I represent were helping to pay this graft, which a candidate for President of the United States at that time branded as "theft within the law."

This same Commonwealth & Southern, through its operating companies, was buying power from the Government at

Muscle Shoals at that time for 2 mills a kilowatt-hour and selling it to domestic consumers within a few hundred yards of the dam at 10 cents a kilowatt-hour—a profit of 4,800 percent.

Why did not the Commonwealth & Southern sell it to the ultimate consumers then 25 percent below what those consumers are paying for it now, when the Commonwealth & Southern itself was buying it 65 percent below what these municipalities and cooperatives are paying for it now? Instead of selling it 25 percent lower, they were actually selling it to the consumers at an average of from 300 to 800 percent higher, as I shall show in a moment.

As I said a moment ago, the T. V. A. does not sell power at retail, but sells it wholesale to these municipalities and cooperative associations; they in turn retail it to the ultimate consumers.

The T. V. A. does not sell power at retail, but sells it wholesale to these municipalities and cooperative associations; they in turn retail it to the ultimate consumers.

The city of Tupelo, and all the other municipalities and cooperatives that use T. V. A. power, buy it wholesale for about 6 mills a kilowatt-hour and retail it at what they call the standard T. V. A. rates, which I shall give you in just a moment.

If this Commonwealth & Southern was paying the Government a profit, as the Army Engineers' report shows it was, when buying this power at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, then surely these municipalities and rural cooperatives are paying a profit for it when they buy it at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour.

ACTUAL COST OF ELECTRIC POWER

As I said, the Army Engineers, in charge of Muscle Shoals at the time this power was being sold to these power companies at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, showed that it was being sold at a profit, and in their report to Congress on March 24, 1930, said:

The sales prices for Wilson Dam power necessary to obtain in order to pay 4 percent on the investment in plant and transmission lines, and to cover the cost of operation and maintenance (indefinitely) of these are based upon the known cost of the hydro plant to date, a careful estimate of additional installation at costs of the present installation, and upon estimates of the cost of transmission lines, and of operation, depreciation, etc. It is seen, therefore, that these prices are based largely upon known costs, and that an error in the items estimated would affect the sales prices but little. The hydro prices reduced to mills per kilowatt-hour would be as follows:

	Mills per kilowatt-hour
At the switchboard.....	1.352
Transmitted 100 miles.....	1.993
Transmitted 200 miles.....	2.310
Transmitted 250 miles.....	2.467
Transmitted 300 miles.....	2.625
Transmitted 350 miles.....	2.775

In other words, this power can be generated and transmitted 100 miles, which is about the distance of Tupelo from Muscle Shoals, for 1.993 mills, or approximately 2 mills, a kilowatt-hour.

But the city of Tupelo is paying three times that price for it, or about 6 mills a kilowatt-hour, selling it to the ultimate consumers at the standard T. V. A. rates, which I will quote in just a moment, paying all expenses, including taxes, and making a profit of \$30,000 a year.

The New York Power Authority made a thorough investigation of the cost of generation and transmission of hydroelectric power on the St. Lawrence River, and in their report of November 10, 1934, they make the following statement:

The cost of transmitting this power can be estimated with confidence. If used as a base load in a State-wide system at least 80 percent of its full-time output can be absorbed. On this basis it could be generated and transmitted to Utica, a distance of 135 miles from the plant, at a cost of about 2¼ mills. It could be delivered at the end of a 300-mile transmission line for less than 3¼ mills per kilowatt-hour.

If the Army Engineers, after careful investigation, reach the conclusion that this power can be generated and transmitted 350 miles and sold at 2.775 mills a kilowatt-hour and the engineers of the New York Power Authority find that power can be generated on the St. Lawrence River and transmitted

300 miles and sold for 3.25 mills a kilowatt-hour, then surely the T. V. A. is not losing money on power generated at Muscle Shoals, transmitted 100 miles, and sold for 6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Besides, let me remind you that the public power plant at Tacoma, Wash., generates and sells power at retail to the ultimate consumers at a cost of less than 5½ mills a kilowatt-hour, and that the Ontario power system generates, transmits, distributes, and sells power retail to the ultimate consumers throughout the Province of Ontario at an average of a little less than 5 mills a kilowatt-hour.

I could cite other examples, but these are sufficient. They completely refute the charge of Mr. "Windy" Wilkie, the spokesman of the Power Trust in this instance, to the effect that the T. V. A. is selling this power below the cost of production.

But here is another example that is a complete answer to these charges. The city of West Point, Miss., 50 miles south of Tupelo, purchases its power wholesale from the Commonwealth & Southern, of which Mr. Wilkie is president. It buys it at about the same rate that Tupelo is paying the T. V. A. For instance, in December 1935, West Point purchased 130,300 kilowatt-hours of electric energy from the Commonwealth & Southern through the Mississippi Power Co., for which it paid \$908.77. Under the T. V. A. wholesale rates, it would have cost \$915.55—or \$6.78 more than West Point actually paid the Commonwealth & Southern for it. In March 1936, the city of West Point purchased from the Commonwealth & Southern, through the Mississippi Power Co., 130,200 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which it paid \$915.07. Under the T. V. A. wholesale rates, it would have cost \$915.70, or 63 cents more than the city of West Point actually paid for it.

West Point could reduce her retail light and power rates now to the Tupelo rates and make money through the sale of power. She would double the consumption of electric energy in a short time, increase the use of electrical appliances, and enable the people of West Point to enjoy the same liberal use of electric energy and electrical appliances now enjoyed by the people of Tupelo, Amory, Corinth, Okolona, and other municipalities and rural communities throughout the T. V. A. area.

It is true that their present contract with the power company will soon expire, but the T. V. A. is ready to offer West Point the same contract that she has with Tupelo at any time.

COMPARISON OF RATES

Here are the residential rates in effect in the Muscle Shoals area at the time of the creation of the T. V. A., showing what the Commonwealth & Southern was charging for power which it was buying at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour. It was selling it to the ultimate consumers at the following rates:

Ten cents per kilowatt-hour for the first 30 kilowatt-hours per month.

Eight cents per kilowatt-hour for the next 170 kilowatt-hours per month.

Seven cents per kilowatt-hour for the next 300 kilowatt-hours per month.

Six cents per kilowatt-hour for the next 350 kilowatt-hours per month.

Five cents per kilowatt-hour for the excess over 350 kilowatt-hours per month.

Here are the T. V. A. residential rates for this same power—the retail rates. This is what it now costs the ultimate consumers at the present time:

Three cents per kilowatt-hour for the first 30 kilowatt-hours per month.

Two cents per kilowatt-hour for the next 150 kilowatt-hours per month.

One cent per kilowatt-hour for the next 200 kilowatt-hours per month.

Four mills per kilowatt-hour for the excess over 400 kilowatt-hours per month.

I hope every consumer of electricity who reads this record will get his canceled light and power bill and compare these rates with the rates he now pays.

The following table will show the comparative cost to the domestic consumers under the old Commonwealth & Southern

rates and the T. V. A. rates up to 1,000 kilowatt-hours per month:

	Former power company rates	Tennessee Valley Authority rates
First 30 kilowatt-hours.....	\$3.00	\$0.90
Next 170 kilowatt-hours.....	13.60	3.60
Next 300 kilowatt-hours.....	21.00	2.40
Next 350 kilowatt-hours.....	21.00	1.40
Next 150 kilowatt-hours.....	7.50	.60
1,000 kilowatt-hours.....	66.10	8.90

In other words, a householder under the T. V. A. rates pays \$8.90 for 1,000 kilowatt-hours a month, which formerly cost him \$66.10 under the power company rates in effect in the Muscle Shoals area at the time the T. V. A. was created.

The Commonwealth & Southern wants to destroy the T. V. A. so that it can impose those outrageous rates again.

In Tacoma, Wash., this 1,000 kilowatt-hours a month would cost \$8.62. In Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, it would cost \$6.17. So it will be seen that the T. V. A. rates are not too low. They are really too high, and will be reduced as time goes on.

In order that the commercial consumers—the merchants, hotel operators, garage and filling-station proprietors, and so forth—may see what overcharges they are paying, I insert at this point a table showing the T. V. A. commercial retail rates now in effect throughout the T. V. A. area.

Available to commercial customers taking service from the municipality's secondary system:

First 250 kilowatt-hours per month at 3 cents per kilowatt-hour.
Next 750 kilowatt-hours per month at 2 cents per kilowatt-hour.
Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours per month at 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.
Excess over 2,000 kilowatt-hours per month at 0.8 cent per kilowatt-hour per month.

Compare the rates your merchants are now paying with these rates and see what the overcharges amount to.

Since I am going to discuss the rates at Tacoma, Wash., and also the Ontario rates, I will give their residential rates now, up to 1,000 kilowatt-hours a month, and compare them with the T. V. A. rates and with the old Commonwealth & Southern rates in effect in that area at the time the T. V. A. was created.

Table of comparative monthly rates

	Monthly consumption						
	25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	60 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	300 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours	1,000 kilowatt-hours
Ontario rates.....	\$0.75	\$1.02	\$1.54	\$1.74	\$3.02	\$3.92	\$6.17
Tacoma rates.....	1.13	1.52	1.72	2.12	4.12	6.12	8.62
Tennessee Valley Authority rates.....	.75	1.20	1.70	2.50	5.50	6.90	8.90
Old Commonwealth & Southern rates.....	2.50	3.80	5.40	8.60	23.00	37.60	66.10

I should like to repeat those figures, if time permitted, especially the last line, showing the old Commonwealth & Southern rates. You will see that, on the whole, the Tacoma rates are lower than the T. V. A. rates, and that the Ontario rates are far below the T. V. A. rates, in every single bracket. These Commonwealth & Southern rates show what the people were paying prior to the creation of the T. V. A., what they would still be paying if it were not for the T. V. A., and what they would be forced to pay again if the Power Trust should succeed in destroying the T. V. A. But that will never happen; the T. V. A. is here to stay. In the words of the French troops at Verdun, "They shall not pass."

RESULT OF LOW RATES

As a result of these cheap rates the people of Ontario are using electricity for all purposes, even to heating their homes. Many of their homes have no chimneys or fireplaces, but depend entirely upon electric heat, which they find much cheaper than either wood or coal. The people of Ontario now refer to electricity as "white coal."

During the year 1935, the city of Tupelo purchased its power from the T. V. A. at approximately the same rates the Commonwealth & Southern is selling it at wholesale to the city of West Point, and sold it at the T. V. A. standard rates above set out. It set aside for taxes \$8,240.13, paid all its depreciation on tangible plant equipment, all interest and sinking funds on outstanding indebtedness against its plant and distribution system, and made a net profit of \$30,132.38; and at the same time the people of Tupelo saved \$150,000 compared with what they would have paid under the old Commonwealth & Southern rates.

At the time the T. V. A. contract went into effect, on February 7, 1934, the average domestic consumption of electricity in the city of Tupelo was 42 kilowatt-hours a month; today it is 157 kilowatt-hours—almost four times what it was under the old rates and more than four times the present average in New York City, where they use only 39 kilowatt-hours a month. At that time domestic consumers of Tupelo were using 195 electric refrigerators and 15 ranges; today they are using 953 refrigerators and 256 ranges. Seventy-two percent of the electric consumers in Tupelo have electric refrigerators, 61 percent of the consumers in Alcorn County, Miss., 59 percent of the consumers in Amory; 52 percent of all the domestic consumers in the T. V. A. area, including the rural areas, have electric refrigerators and 22 percent have electric ranges, to say nothing of the increase in the electrical appliances in the rural districts, such as washing machines, water pumps, and so forth.

The people in the counties of Alcorn, Prentiss, Tishomingo, Lee, Itawamba, and in the northern part of Monroe are saving more than \$500,000 a year as compared with what they would have paid under the old Commonwealth & Southern retail rates. Rural power lines are now being built throughout the area, electrifying thousands of farm homes that heretofore never had received any electricity and probably never would have received any at all if it had not been for the T. V. A.

As I said, the people of the city of Tupelo alone are saving \$150,000 a year on their light and power bills compared with what they would have paid under the old Commonwealth & Southern rates in effect at the time the T. V. A. was created; and the people in Lee and Itawamba Counties, outside of the city of Tupelo, are saving an additional \$100,000 or \$125,000 a year—making more than a quarter of a million dollars saved by the people of the two counties every year that rolls round.

The people in Tupelo are already beginning to heat their homes with electricity. It is proving to be the most desirable heat to be had—no dust, no soot, no grease, no moisture, and no janitor.

I have before me the light and power bill of a man who uses electric lights, radio, refrigerator, iron, range, grill, fans, vacuum cleaner, water heater, and who also heats his entire house electrically. During the month of January 1936 he used 2,706 kilowatt-hours of electric energy and his entire bill for the month amounted to \$15.72.

Let me call your attention to the fact that Tupelo is not in a tropical climate, as some people seem to think. The temperature at that place went as low as 8° below zero last winter.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

But in my opinion, the greatest part of this program is its rural-electrification feature, taking cheap lights and power to the farmers of the country. The following is a schedule of rates those farmers pay, even in the remotest rural sections:

First 50 kilowatt-hours per month 4 cents per kilowatt-hour.
Next 50 kilowatt-hours per month 3 cents per kilowatt-hour.
Next 100 kilowatt-hours per month 2 cents per kilowatt-hour.
Next 200 kilowatt-hours per month 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.
Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours per month 4 mills per kilowatt-hour.

It will be noted that for the first 50 kilowatt-hours per month, these farmers pay 4 cents a kilowatt-hour instead of 3 cents, and for the next 50 kilowatt-hours they pay 3 cents instead of 2 cents a kilowatt-hour. The extra 1 cent per kilowatt-hour goes to amortize their lines and distribution systems. This is all these people will ever have to pay. In

the course of a few years their lines will be paid out and then this extra 1 cent will be taken off.

Nothing that has ever come to the farmers of this country has brought so much light and hope or relieved so much drudgery as cheap electric energy. I have before me large numbers of answers to questionnaires which I sent to these farmers, showing the amount of electricity they used per month, the amount paid for it, and the appliances employed.

I find here one who uses lights, radio, electric iron, fans, washing machine, water pump, electric range. One month he used 83 kilowatt-hours of electricity energy, which cost him \$2.99.

Here is another who uses lights, radio, iron, fans, and washing machine. He used 50 kilowatt-hours of electricity one month, which cost him exactly \$2.

Here is one who uses lights in his home and in his barn, radio, refrigerator, iron, fans, water pump, and electric range. He used 116 kilowatt-hours of electricity one month, which cost him \$3.72.

Here is one who uses lights, radio, refrigerator, iron, heater, range, chicken brooder, and washing machine. He used 124 kilowatt-hours a month, which cost him \$3.19.

This cheap electricity is literally bringing to these farmers, to their wives and children, a new civilization. Something of which they had scarcely dreamed a few years ago.

We have electric power associations organized in every county in the district, and it is my purpose to keep up the drive until we electrify every farm home in the district at T. V. A. rates. Nor do I propose to stop there, but I expect to continue this drive as long as I live, whether in public or in private life, or until we electrify every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is it not a fact that the Power Trust is charging rates that are prohibitive in the rural sections over and above the city rates?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; their rural rates are so high as to be prohibitive.

A BILLION-DOLLAR OVERCHARGE

Some time ago I stated on this floor that the people of this country were being overcharged \$1,000,000,000 a year for electric lights and power. That statement has never been seriously challenged. I now find that my figures were too conservative, and that they are overcharged approximately \$1,500,000,000 a year—or enough to pay the national debt in 20 years.

I am going to break this overcharge down by States and show the amount the people of each State have to pay. I want each of you to observe the overcharges for your own State, and then tell me how any honest representative of the American people can vote against the power policies of this administration that would cure this evil and bring justice to these helpless consumers of electric energy.

Now, let us make some comparisons and see just how much the American people are being overcharged annually for electric energy. Let us first compare the amount the people in the United States are paying for electricity with what the people in the Province of Ontario, Canada, pay.

In 1934 the Ontario Power Commission generated and sold 6,420,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy for \$31,970,000 delivered to the ultimate consumers, which averaged a little less than 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. In other words, the Ontario Power Commission delivered power to the ultimate consumers, retail, for less than the city of Tupelo is paying the T. V. A. wholesale. Remember, too, that this Ontario power was invariably transmitted hundreds of miles, and sometimes into the remotest rural precincts.

The power propagandists in this country have attempted in every conceivable way to discredit the Ontario Power Commission and to mislead the American people as to what it is doing for the people of Ontario. It is a nonprofit cooperative organization, representing the municipalities, rural power districts, and so forth, of the Province of Ontario. Its object is to generate and supply power to the people of Ontario at cost.

It was fostered by Sir Adam Beck, one of the great men of Canada, and started operations about 1910. Mr. Beck remained at the head of the commission until his death in 1926.

The annual report of the Ontario Power Commission for 1934 shows the capital invested in the entire system, including the municipal and rural distribution system, amounted to \$398,224,762.11, while the total reserves of the commission and the municipal electric utilities, for sinking funds, renewals, contingencies, insurance, and so forth, amounted to \$138,392,201.38.

The capital investment of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission proper at the present time is \$295,784,660.81, against which they have a reserve for sinking funds alone amounting to \$35,482,281.67, leaving a balance of \$260,312,379.14.

The municipal electric utilities, which are also a part of this system, have total liabilities at the present time amounting to \$43,210,000, against which there are liquid assets, such as bank and cash balances, securities and investments, accounts payable, inventories, sinking funds on local debentures, and other assets, amounting to \$20,550,000, leaving the actual liabilities for these municipal electric utilities amounting to \$22,660,000. This, added to the actual liabilities of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission, make the liabilities of the entire system, including the municipal utilities, amount to \$282,972,379.14.

In the course of 25 years this organization has built one of the greatest power systems on earth, which it is gradually paying out, and at the same time affording to the people of Ontario the cheapest light and power rates on the Western Hemisphere. At the time this commission was organized the domestic consumers of Canada were paying from 9 cents to 20 cents per kilowatt-hour for electric energy. The number of domestic consumers at that time was very small, and the average consumption ranged from 10 to 30 kilowatt-hours per month. Today they enjoy the lowest rates and the highest per-capita consumption of electricity to be found on this continent.

In 1935, the record shows that the people of the United States consumed 77,555,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for all purposes, for which they paid \$1,921,000,000. In 1934, the people of Ontario consumed 6,420,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for all purposes, for which they paid \$31,790,000. In other words, the people of the United States used 12 times as much electric energy in 1 year as was used in the Province of Ontario in 1 year, and paid 60 times as much for it—or an average of 5 times the rates paid by the people of Ontario.

If the people of Ontario had consumed the same amount of electricity as did the people of the United States, it would have cost them 12 times \$31,790,000, or \$381,480,000. Take \$381,480,000, the amount they would have paid under the Ontario rates, from \$1,921,000,000, the amount they actually did pay, and you will see that the people of the United States were overcharged \$1,539,520,000 for electric lights and power a year, compared with the Ontario rates—more than enough to pay off the national debt in 20 years, including all the obligations incurred for relief and rehabilitation since March 4, 1933.

How on earth can the American people continue to stagger under such burdens?

But the power companies tell you that the Ontario Power Commission pays no taxes. A thorough investigation made in the State of Washington, where the power companies have boasted most about the taxes they pay, showed that the taxes paid by the power interests in that State, for all purposes—Federal, State, county, and municipal—amounted in the aggregate to not more than 1 mill per kilowatt-hour of the power actually sold. This would make all the taxes paid by the power interests in the United States amount to not more than \$77,555,000 a year. Take that amount from this overcharge of \$1,539,000,000 a year and it will still leave an overcharge of \$1,461,000,000 a year, on the basis of the present consumption.

But owing to their low rates, the people of Ontario consume more than three times as much electricity per capita

as do the people in the United States. If we consumed as much electricity per capita, for all purposes, in this country as do the people of Ontario, and paid the rates now charged in the United States, this overcharge would amount to \$4,383,000,000 in 1 year, even after allowing for taxes. That would pay the national debt in less than 10 years.

But the power companies have made the claim that their taxes, for all purposes, amounted to 10 percent of the gross sales. Of course, that is an exaggeration. But suppose they did; that would make their taxes in the whole United States amount to \$192,100,000 for the year, which, taken from this \$1,539,520,000, would still leave the American people paying an overcharge of \$1,347,420,000 a year when compared with the Ontario rates. If the people in this country consumed as much electricity per capita as do the people in Ontario, and paid the rates they are now paying in the United States, this overcharge, after deducting 10 percent for taxes, would amount to \$4,042,000,000 a year, which would be sufficient to pay off the national debt in less than 10 years, including all obligations for relief and rehabilitation since 1933.

These figures cannot be denied; they are based upon the record.

Now, let us compare these rates with the rates in Tacoma, Wash. Tacoma has a public plant, a cooperative system that is entirely separate and distinct from the city government. Their entire plant and distribution system is valued at \$23,038,147, and the indebtedness against it has been paid down to \$7,343,000. At the rate they are going the plant will soon be paid out, and then further reductions in rates will be possible.

Although Tacoma is a city of only 106,000 people, they have the lowest electric light and power rates in the United States. In 1934 they generated and sold 244,650,127 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for all purposes, which they sold for \$2,055,195. After paying all operating expenses, including interest and sinking fund, and after paying taxes to the amount of \$145,575, they had a net profit of \$744,531. Since these consumers own the system, this net profit went back to them in payment of their indebtedness on the plant. Take this net profit from the \$2,055,195, the amount of the gross sales, and it will leave \$1,310,664 as the amount this electricity actually cost the ultimate consumers, retail, after paying all expenses, interest on the investment, sinking funds, and taxes.

Therefore, this electricity cost the ultimate consumers in Tacoma on an average of a little less than 5½ mills a kilowatt-hour for all purposes, or less than we are paying the T. V. A. for power, wholesale, in the Tennessee Valley area.

The 77,555,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which the American people paid \$1,921,000,000 in 1935 would have cost \$414,000,000 under the Tacoma rates, or \$1,507,000,000 less than the people of this country actually paid for it.

But suppose the American people used as much electricity per capita as do the people in Tacoma; then the annual consumption in the United States would be 293,707,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The cost to the ultimate consumers of that amount of electricity, under the Tacoma rates, would be \$1,573,200,000. If they used that amount and paid the rates now paid throughout the United States the cost to the ultimate consumers would be \$7,299,800,000, or \$5,726,600,000 more than if they paid the Tacoma rates. In other words, if the people of this country used as much electricity per capita as do the people of Tacoma and paid the rates they are now paying, the overcharge, compared with the Tacoma rates, would amount to \$5,726,600,000 a year.

Yet the public plant at Tacoma pays taxes, just the same as if it were a private power company, or a private individual, is rapidly paying off its indebtedness and will soon be making additional reductions.

While we are trying to make it possible for the American people to enjoy a more liberal use of electricity, in order that they may be able to use more of those electrical appliances necessary for the comforts and conveniences of the home, the private power companies are discouraging a liberal use of electricity by imposing upon the consumers the very highest rates the traffic will bear.

COMPARISON OF INVESTMENTS

Now, let us compare the investments. According to the 1934 statistical bulletin of the Edison Electric Institute, the investment of private power companies in the United States amounted to \$12,124,817,425; while the municipal companies have invested \$539,569,527, making a total of \$12,664,376,952. As pointed out before, they produce and sell only 77,555,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy a year, or 12 times the amount produced and sold in Ontario, where they have investments amounting to \$398,224,000. It would take 12 such power systems as they have in Ontario, operating as they do, to produce the same amount of power sold in the United States. That would mean an investment of 12 times \$398,224,000, or \$4,778,688,000. That is what the investment would amount to if the Ontario system were expanded on the present basis to where it would produce the same amount of power now produced and sold in the United States, where the investment is alleged to be \$12,664,376,000, or \$7,835,688,000 more than would be necessary under the Canadian system.

The Power Trust has poured something like \$7,000,000,000 or more of water into its capital structure, floated watered stocks and sold them out to unsuspecting, innocent purchasers in every State in the Union, and your constituents in every State are now being compelled to pay light and power rates based upon these fictitious and dishonest valuations. Was there ever a more consummate example of "thievery within the law"?

What does this \$7,000,000,000 represent?

It represents mostly paper, printers' ink, and Power Trust rascality.

But the power companies say they have many elements of expense the Tennessee Valley Authority does not have to meet. That is true; here are some of the items of cost to the Power Trust that the T. V. A. does not have to meet:

First. Dividends on watered stocks—such as the \$7,000,000,000 to which I have just referred.

Second. Tributes to useless holding companies such as the Commonwealth & Southern.

Third. Enormous salaries which grasping officials and directors pay themselves, ranging all the way from \$25,000 to \$250,000 a year.

Fourth. Bonuses and other rake-offs, sometimes running into the millions.

Fifth. Money spent to employ high-priced lawyers for their political influence—invariably relatives or business partners of public officials, such as members of the legislature, governors, Congressmen, and Senators.

Sixth. Expenses of propaganda such as the power interests have been spending by the millions, on telegrams, letters, and so forth, trying to browbeat Congress into defeating the administration's bill to put an end to racketeering through useless holding companies.

Seventh. Then there is money spent to buy up newspapers and magazines. They used to buy advertisements in newspapers. Then they began to buy headlines, news columns, and editorials. Now they just buy the papers or a controlling interest in them and hire their own editors and reporters. Sometimes they just buy the editor.

Eighth. Then there are their expensive lobbyists around Congress and the various State legislatures, to say nothing of the campaign expenses they have to put up for their favorite candidates for office.

Ninth. Campaign contributions which they are now pouring out, in an indirect and insidious effort to defeat this administration or destroy its power policies, so that they may continue to wring the economic lifeblood from the American people with these enormous overcharges, or to plunder the unsuspecting investors through the sale of worthless watered stocks.

The T. V. A. does not have to meet all these expenses, therefore it can sell power wholesale to these municipalities and cooperative associations at something like what it is worth.

These municipalities and cooperative associations do not have these expenses to meet, and therefore they can sell power retail to the ultimate consumers at something like what it is worth.

Neither the Tacoma Power Commission nor the Ontario Power Commission have any of these enormous burdens to meet, therefore they can afford to sell power to the ultimate consumers at something like what it is worth.

A little more than a year ago I had compiled and published the amount of overcharges for electricity in this country for 1934, and broke it down by States. I am going to reproduce those figures here. While they show that the American people, in every State in the Union, are carrying a staggering burden in these overcharges, yet if you will compare them with the overcharges for 1935, which I have just quoted, you will find that these 1934 figures are extremely conservative. Any 10-year-old school boy or girl can figure this proposition out for themselves. Applying the rates and overcharges for 1935 to the amount of electricity consumed in each State in 1934, and assuming that they use the same amount of electricity in each State in 1935 as they used in 1934, the overcharges for the year 1935 were far greater than these figures show they were in 1934.

If you will divide the overcharges in your State by the number of congressional districts, then you will see what portion of this burden is borne by the people you are sent here to represent.

You cannot escape responsibility. The people of your State have a right to expect you to help protect them. The responsibility for this condition, if it is permitted to continue, will rest upon the Congress of the United States.

OVERCHARGES BY STATES

Here are the overcharges by States. Look over them carefully and you will see what part of this billion-dollar overcharge the people of your State have to pay.

MAINE

In 1934 the people of the State of Maine consumed 575,506,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$10,761,000.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$5,675,000, a saving of \$5,086,000.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been \$5,432,000, a saving of \$5,329,000.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$4,431,000, a saving of \$6,330,000.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

In 1934 the people of the State of New Hampshire consumed 183,274,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$6,791,000.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$3,349,000, a saving of \$3,442,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$3,332,000, a saving of \$3,459,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$2,778,000, a saving of \$4,013,000.

VERMONT AND RHODE ISLAND

In 1934 the people in the two small States of Vermont and Rhode Island together used 481,171,873 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$17,300,221.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$9,078,221, a saving of \$8,222,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$8,933,221, a saving of \$8,367,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$7,096,867, a saving of \$10,203,354.

MASSACHUSETTS

In 1934 the people in the State of Massachusetts consumed 1,993,560,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid the sum of \$75,499,187.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$38,315,000, a saving of \$37,184,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$37,942,187, a saving of \$37,557,000.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$30,-112,730, a saving of \$45,386,457.

CONNECTICUT

In 1934, the people in the State of Connecticut used 811,-158,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid the sum of \$30,123,083.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$15,-672,083, a saving of \$14,451,000.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been \$15,-726,086, a saving of \$14,397,000.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$12,-352,492, a saving of \$17,770,594.

NEW YORK

The people of the State of New York, in 1934, used 8,295,012,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid the sum of \$255,454,676.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$129,-755,676, a saving of \$125,699,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$127,-836,676, a saving of \$127,618,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$101,-306,539, a saving of \$154,148,137.

No wonder the Power Trust is opposing the development of the St. Lawrence project, which would give to the people of the State of New York and adjoining States lights and power at reasonable rates and save them from having to pay this enormous overcharge.

NEW JERSEY

In 1934 the people of the State of New Jersey used 1,839,-677,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$76,487,173.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$37,-364,173, a saving of \$39,123,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$36,-924,173, a saving of \$39,563,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$29,-724,156, a saving of \$46,763,017.

PENNSYLVANIA

In 1934 the people of the State of Pennsylvania used 5,591,808,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid the sum of \$152,567,854.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$81,-398,854, a saving of \$71,169,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$77,-660,854, a saving of \$74,907,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$63,-313,688, a saving of \$89,254,166.

In the State of Pennsylvania, in addition to this enormous overcharge imposed upon the consumers of electric energy, the utilities have been powerful enough in years past to exempt their real-estate holdings from taxation by statute through their control of the State legislature.

Today they own \$100,000,000 worth of real estate in Pennsylvania that is escaping all taxes—State, county, and municipal. That burden is passed on to the unprotected people of Pennsylvania, although these utilities own large office buildings, space in which is rented to the public, thus bringing them additional revenues, while they escape the burden of taxation which the small-business man and the home owners pay.

OHIO

In 1934 the people of the State of Ohio used 3,418,060,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$98,-215,219.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$51,372,-219, a saving of \$46,843,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$50,686,-219, a saving of \$47,529,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$40,198,-328, a saving of \$58,016,891.

Ohio is a great wheat-growing State, producing around 35,000,000 bushels a year. Yet if every grain of wheat grown in Ohio in 1934 were sold at the highest price on today's market, it would lack from \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 of bringing enough money to pay this overcharge in the State of Ohio alone.

INDIANA

In 1934 the people of the State of Indiana used 1,209,459,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$39,-861,716.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$20,677,-716, a saving of \$19,184,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$20,672,-716, a saving of \$19,189,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$16,219,-967, a saving of \$23,641,749.

ILLINOIS

In 1934 the people of the State of Illinois used 3,918,305,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$122,-506,776.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$64,-032,776, a saving of \$58,474,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$63,-245,776, a saving of \$59,261,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$50,-002,211, a saving of \$72,504,565.

MICHIGAN

In 1934 the people of the State of Michigan used 2,589,-125,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$69,958,547.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$35,-933,547, a saving of \$34,025,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$36,-190,547, a saving of \$33,768,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$28,-235,230, a saving of \$41,723,317.

WISCONSIN

In 1934 the people of the State of Wisconsin used 1,188,-207,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$37,026,068.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$19,-133,068, a saving of \$17,893,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$19,-239,068, a saving of \$17,787,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$15,-025,274, a saving of \$22,000,794.

MINNESOTA

In 1934 the people of the State of Minnesota used 891,683,-000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$29,895,355.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$15,-435,355, a saving of \$14,460,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$15,-984,355, a saving of \$13,911,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$12,-133,336, a saving of \$17,762,019.

IOWA

In 1934 the people of the State of Iowa used 672,600,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid the sum of \$25,258,621.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$12,-778,621, a saving of \$12,480,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$13,-450,621, a saving of \$11,808,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$10,-115,975, a saving of \$15,142,646.

MISSOURI

In 1934 the people of the State of Missouri used 1,416,-997,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid the sum of \$42,521,922.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$21,453,-922, a saving of \$21,068,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$22,272,-922, a saving of \$20,249,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$16,952,-246, a saving of \$25,569,676.

NORTH DAKOTA

In 1934 the people of the State of North Dakota used 70,816,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$4,354,173.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$2,170,-173, a saving of \$2,184,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$2,494,-173, a saving of \$1,860,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$1,724,-702, a saving of \$2,629,471.

SOUTH DAKOTA

In 1934 the people of the State of South Dakota used 88,336,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$5,001,302.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$2,521,-302, a saving of \$2,480,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$2,656,-302, a saving of \$2,345,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$1,996,-863, a saving of \$3,004,439.

NEBRASKA

In 1934 the people of the State of Nebraska used 383,685,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$13,-799,571.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$6,643,571, a saving of \$7,156,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$7,029,-517, a saving of \$6,770,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$5,500,-587, a saving of \$8,298,984.

KANSAS

In 1934 the people of the State of Kansas used 583,507,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$18,-835,232.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$9,661,-232, a saving of \$9,174,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$9,881,-232, a saving of \$8,954,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$7,609,-114, a saving of \$11,226,118.

DELAWARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MARYLAND, AND WEST VIRGINIA

In 1934 the people of the State of Delaware, the District of Columbia, and the States of Maryland and West Virginia together used 2,119,605,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$52,659,441.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$27,-789,441, a saving of \$24,870,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$27,-897,441, a saving of \$24,762,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$21,-674,366, a saving of \$30,985,075.

VIRGINIA

In 1934 the people of the State of Virginia used 735,802,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$20,049,222.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$10,-449,222, a saving of \$9,600,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$10,-351,222, a saving of \$9,698,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$8,-189,768, a saving of \$11,859,454.

NORTH CAROLINA

In 1934 the people of the State of North Carolina used 1,239,893,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$23,396,108.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$12,-754,108, a saving of \$10,642,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$11,-743,108, a saving of \$11,653,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$9,858,206, a saving of \$13,537,902.

SOUTH CAROLINA

In 1934 the people of the State of South Carolina used 736,552,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$12,407,190.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$6,840,190, a saving of \$5,567,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$6,115,190, a saving of \$6,292,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$5,250,539, a saving of \$7,156,651.

GEORGIA

In 1934 the people of the State of Georgia used 876,614,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid \$20,194,417.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$10,528,417, a saving of \$9,666,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$10,294,417, a saving of \$9,900,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$8,229,248, a saving of \$11,965,169.

FLORIDA

In 1934 the people of the State of Florida used 404,425,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$18,206,511.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$9,065,-511, a saving of \$9,141,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$9,741,-511, a saving of \$8,465,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$7,206,-617, a saving of \$10,999,894.

KENTUCKY

In 1934 the people of the State of Kentucky used 712,-619,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$17,303,256.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$9,076,-256, a saving of \$8,227,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$8,905,-256, a saving of \$8,398,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$7,094,-794, a saving of \$10,208,322.

TENNESSEE

In 1934 the people of the State of Tennessee used 946,-883,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$20,764,172.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$10,-912,172, a saving of \$9,852,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$10,-563,172, a saving of \$10,201,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$8,512,-517, a saving of \$12,251,655.

ALABAMA

In 1934 the people of the State of Alabama used 634,292,-000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$12,978,651.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$6,815,-651, a saving of \$6,163,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$6,634,-651, a saving of \$6,344,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$5,322,-608, a saving of \$7,656,043.

MISSISSIPPI

In 1934, the people of the State of Mississippi used 324,-590,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$8,336,241.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$4,405,-241, a saving of \$3,931,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$4,269,-241, a saving of \$4,117,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$3,438,-882, a saving of \$4,947,359.

ARKANSAS

In 1934 the people of the State of Arkansas used 255,988,-000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$8,667,560.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$4,510,-560, a saving of \$4,157,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$4,456,-560, a saving of \$4,211,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$3,532,-381, a saving of \$5,135,179.

LOUISIANA

In 1934 the people of the State of Louisiana used 557,718,-000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$15,460,717.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$8,059,717, a saving of \$7,401,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$7,983,717, a saving of \$7,477,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$6,312,264, a saving of \$9,148,453.

OKLAHOMA

In 1934 the people of the State of Oklahoma used 551,388,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$18,305,275.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$9,666,275, a saving of \$8,639,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$9,359,275, a saving of \$8,946,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$7,538,678, a saving of \$10,766,597.

TEXAS

In 1934 the people of the State of Texas used 1,683,558,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$51,403,516.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$26,491,516, a saving of \$24,922,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$26,481,516, a saving of \$24,922,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$20,789,117, a saving of \$30,614,399.

MONTANA AND UTAH

In 1934 the people of the States of Montana and Utah together used 536,139,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$13,630,783.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$7,084,783, a saving of \$6,546,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$7,041,783, a saving of \$6,589,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$5,550,944, a saving of \$8,079,839.

IDAHO

In 1934 the people of the State of Idaho used 292,135,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$5,750,348.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$2,989,348, a saving of \$2,761,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$2,961,348, a saving of \$2,789,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$2,342,323, a saving of \$3,408,025.

WYOMING

In 1934 the people of the State of Wyoming used 79,225,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$2,745,869.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$1,427,869, a saving of \$1,318,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$1,422,869, a saving of \$1,323,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$1,119,126, a saving of \$1,626,743.

COLORADO

In 1934 the people of the State of Colorado used 441,982,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$13,339,906.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$6,934,906, a saving of \$6,405,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$6,878,906, a saving of \$6,461,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$5,432,769, a saving of \$7,907,137.

ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO

In 1934 the people of the States of Arizona and New Mexico used 264,057,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$8,929,686.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$4,642,686, a saving of \$4,287,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$4,585,686, a saving of \$4,344,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$3,635,904, a saving of \$5,293,782.

NEVADA

In 1934 the people of the State of Nevada used 94,760,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$2,154,764.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$1,120,764, a saving of \$1,034,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$1,108,764, a saving of \$1,046,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$897,430, a saving of \$1,257,334.

WASHINGTON

In 1934 the people of the State of Washington used 1,576,070,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$24,615,571.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$12,427,571, a saving of \$12,188,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$12,954,571, a saving of \$11,661,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$9,825,735, a saving of \$14,789,836.

OREGON

In 1934 the people of the State of Oregon used 637,926,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$13,833,329.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$6,904,329, a saving of \$6,929,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$7,323,329, a saving of \$6,510,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$5,478,029, a saving of \$8,355,300.

CALIFORNIA

In 1934 the people of the State of California used 4,325,505,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, for which they paid \$107,606,211.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$54,103,211, a saving of \$53,503,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been \$56,659,211, a saving of \$50,947,000.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been \$42,816,608, a saving of \$64,789,603.

CONCLUSION

How long will our people continue to stagger under such burdens?

That is a matter for them to decide. They can get relief at any time if they will only demand that every public official represent them and their cause in this great battle for human justice, this battle of the century.

As for my part, I have enlisted for the duration of the conflict. I expect to continue in this fight as long as I live, or until we get electric lights and power supplied to the people in every State in the Union at rates based upon the actual cost of production and distribution, and until we electrify every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request, and I thank the House for its attention. [Applause.]

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks on the long- and short-haul bill on March 20, 1936, I included a list of two or three hundred organizations which

favor the bill. Among them I listed the American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

My authority for including the American Newspaper Publishers' Association among those favoring the bill was the first report of Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, as Federal Coordinator, to the Interstate Commerce Commission, under date of March 10, 1934. I quote from page 134 of the original mimeographed copy of that report as follows:

The fourth section has from the beginning been a subject of bitter controversy. . . . On the whole, sentiment favors modification or repeal. Of the important responses on the question, filed with the Coordinator, 82 favored some modification, 46 favored repeal, and 47 were against any change.

Among those favoring repeal are the National Industrial Traffic League, the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

And so forth. I am now advised by the American Newspaper Publishers Association that they were incorrectly reported in the above statement by the Federal Coordinator.

I acted in good faith, relying upon an official Government report, but in view of representations now made to me by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, I am glad to correct the statement in my speech of March 20, 1936.

This correction is not to be construed as placing the American Newspaper Publishers Association in opposition to the bill. As I understand their position, they have taken no action either for or against change or repeal of the fourth section.

OHIO FARMERS MAKE MONEY

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, cash receipts from the sale of principal farm products in Ohio rose from \$155,468,000 in 1932 to \$262,213,000 in 1935, including \$15,210,000 in rental and benefit payments.

This is an increase of 69 percent.

For Ohio, cash receipts represent approximately 93 percent of the total farm cash income from production.

Price changes on certain selected commodities, which brought about a considerable share of the increased cash receipts indicated above, are shown in table 1.

TABLE 1.—Average prices received by Ohio farmers for commodities listed on dates specified

Commodity	Aug. 15, 1932	Mar. 15, 1933	Dec. 15, 1935
Wheat (per bushel).....	\$0.46	\$0.45	\$0.88
Corn (per bushel).....	.28	.22	.45
Oats (per bushel).....	.17	.16	.26
Barley (per bushel).....	.24	.23	.39
Rye (per bushel).....	.29	.30	.45
Buckwheat (per bushel).....	.41	.41	.49
Potatoes (per bushel).....	.65	.46	.55
Hay (all loose, per ton).....	4.30	4.40	6.30
Apples (per bushel).....	.55	.90	.75
Hogs (per hundredweight).....	4.60	3.60	9.30
Beef cattle (per hundredweight).....	5.00	4.10	7.60
Veal calves (per hundredweight).....	5.40	5.40	9.90
Milk cows (per head).....	36.00	30.00	50.00
Chickens (per pound).....	.127	.092	.167
Butter (per pound).....	.20	.18	.32
Eggs (per dozen).....	.147	.096	.292
Wool (per pound unwashed).....	.09	.11	.26

For the United States as a whole, the yearly average price of all groups of farm products increased from 65 percent to 108 percent of the pre-war level during the period 1932-35, an increase of 66 percent.

The low point occurred in March 1933, when prices were only 55 percent of the pre-war level, whereas in December 1935 they averaged 110 percent of that level.

These figures do not include rental and benefit payments.

The gain in exchange value of farm products per unit was somewhat less than the gain in farm prices, since prices farmers pay for commodities used in living and production also advanced about 17 percent during the period.

The exchange value per unit of farm products increased from 61 percent of the pre-war level in 1932 to 86 percent in 1935, a gain of about 41 percent.

FARMERS GET MORE MONEY FOR THEIR FARMS

A new appreciation of farm real estate in Ohio has been one result of increased farm income.

The number of forced farm sales per thousand declined from 34.1 for the year ending March 1933, to 19.5 for the year ending in March 1935.

Voluntary sales and trades of farms, during the same period, increased from 16 per thousand to 19.1 per thousand.

For the first time since 1920 the decline in value of farm real estate per acre halted in the year ending March 1933, when it stood at a low of 59, the State average value from 1912 to 1914 being 100.

From this low of 59 in 1933, the estimated value per acre rose to 66 for the year ending March 1935.

WORKERS GET 18 PERCENT MORE PAY

On January 1, 1933, estimates by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicate the demand for farm labor in Ohio was 47 percent below the standard accepted as normal and the supply 31 percent above.

At the same time the average farm wage rate per person, with board, was \$16.75.

Three years later, on January 1, 1936, the farm-labor demand was only 20 percent below normal and supply was 9 percent below normal.

The average farm-wage rate per person, with board, stood at \$19.75, having advanced 18 percent above their 1933 level.

ROOSEVELT SOIL-CONSERVATION PLAN AIDS FARMERS

The programs of agricultural adjustment, from their launching in the spring of 1933, were concerned with good use of the land of cooperating farmers as well as with adjustment of crop acreage in line with effective demand.

Farm leaders and administration officials recognized from the start that relieving a proportion of farm land from the soil-exhausting burden of major-crop production created an unprecedented opportunity for putting this land to the soil-conserving uses which farm specialists for many years had been advocating.

IMPROVING FARM LIVING CONDITIONS

Adjustment contracts included provisions encouraging beneficial uses for acreage taken out of surplus crops.

The first corn-hog contract, offered farmers in 1934, authorized use of the rented acreage only "for planting additional permanent pasture; for soil-improving and erosion-preventing crops not to be harvested; for resting or fallowing the land; for weed eradication; or for planting farm wood lots."

The cotton contracts for 1934-35 specified use of the rented acres only for "soil-improving crops; erosion-preventing crops; food crops for consumption by the producer on his farm; feed crops for the production of livestock or livestock products for consumption or use by the producer on his farm; or fallowing; or such other uses as may be permitted by the Secretary of Agriculture or his authorized agent."

Food and feed crops for home use were authorized on rented acres in the South, because it was recognized that the standard of farm living in this region, which contains half of the farm population of the country, might thereby be improved.

The tobacco contracts carried similar provisions.

A GAIN OF 800,000 ACRES FOR PASTURE

In the 1934 crop year, the first in which the adjustment programs were in full swing, farmers agreed to shift their production on nearly 36,000,000 acres.

These acres represented 1 out of every 9 of cultivated land in the country.

Farmers in Ohio shifted 590,000 acres from corn, wheat, and tobacco production. Of the 36,000,000 shifted acres in the United States, it has been estimated that about one-third was put in pasture or meadow crops, one-third in acres of emergency forage crops and in crops that supplied food and feed for home use, and the remaining one-third was fallowed to conserve moisture and control weeds, planted

to farm wood lots, or left idle. The acreage left idle was very small.

DAIRY CATTLE DISEASE ERADICATION

Milk has been an important source of farm income in Ohio. For the past few years more than \$42,000,000 in cash has been returned to milk producers annually.

In 1934 alone they received a cash income of over \$52,000,000. They are therefore interested in steps taken by the Government to safeguard the health of their herds.

Approximately \$50,000,000 of Agricultural Adjustment Administration funds have been made available for cattle disease eradication in the United States, primarily bovine tuberculosis, Bang's disease, and mastitis.

This work is being done in cooperation with the Bureau of Animal Industry.

As of December 31, 1935, some 943,916 cattle in Ohio had been given the tuberculin test, and about 297,837 cattle in Ohio had been given the agglutination test for Bang's disease.

Of the \$178,000 allocated for the eradication of bovine tuberculosis in this State, \$177,575.61 had been expended in operating expenses and indemnities at the close of 1935.

Of the \$1,700,000 allocated the State for the eradication of Bang's disease, \$937,211 had been spent in indemnities and operating expenses through December 1935.

EXTENT OF FARMER PARTICIPATION IN ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

From the inauguration of the adjustment programs in 1933 through January 6, 1936, approximately 209,648 adjustment contracts signed by Ohio farmers were accepted by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Of this number of contracts, 110,479 were corn-hog, 69,928 wheat, 23,741 tobacco, and about 5,500 sugar.

Ohio farmers have evidenced their cooperation in A. A. A. programs by their votes in four referenda on these and related measures.

During the first 2 weeks of October 1934 corn-hog producers were asked whether they favored an adjustment program for 1935.

In this referendum Ohio producers numbering 16,753 voted for a program, while 12,704 voted against.

A Nation-wide wheat referendum was conducted on May 25, 1935, in which producers were asked, "Are you in favor of a wheat-production program to follow the present one, which expires with the 1935 crop year?"

In Ohio 20,407 votes were cast, all but 5,719 of which favored such a program.

Last summer producers of flue-cured, burley, fire-cured, dark air-cured, and cigar-leaf tobacco were asked whether they favored a production-adjustment program to follow the one which expired with the crop year 1935.

Burley producers in Ohio favored a program for 1936 by a vote of 3,332 to 510.

Ohio cigar-leaf growers favored a 1936 program by a vote of 2,360 to 218.

The last referendum in this State was that conducted on October 26, 1935, in which corn-hog producers were asked whether they favored a corn-hog program for 1936.

Official returns indicated that 35,116 favored such a program, while 6,237 opposed.

RENTAL AND BENEFIT PAYMENTS IN OHIO

As of December 31, 1935, rental and benefit payments in Ohio aggregated \$27,885,711.07.

Of this amount cooperating corn-hog farmers received \$20,913,765.10; wheat growers, \$4,534,493.41; tobacco producers, \$1,790,519.98; and sugar raisers, \$646,932.58.

Until January 6, 1936, funds to provide these rental-benefit payments were raised through processing taxes.

As of December 31, 1935, processing-tax collections made in Ohio totaled \$30,616,213.03.

Processing taxes were collected through the medium of first processors, or converters of the raw agricultural products—millers, packers, cotton and tobacco manufacturers—wherever these processing establishments were located.

They were paid by consumers throughout the country wherever the processed articles were sold.

FARMERS' MONEY GOES TO TOWN

The increased income of cotton, wheat, and corn-hog farmers did not remain out in the country, where those products were raised.

The farmers' money found its way to town and to the industrial centers of the country, where it put people to work.

The extent to which increased farm income during the past 3 years enabled farmers to increase their purchases of city-made goods and services reflected in several ways.

New automobile registrations in Ohio were approximately as follows: 73,714 in 1932; 112,363 in 1933; 148,932 in 1934; 203,160 in 1935. The increase from 1932 to 1935 was 176 percent.

According to Automobile Facts and Figures, a publication of the Automobile Manufacturers' Association, the 1934 retail automobile-sales gain in Ohio was greatest in small towns and on farms. From 1933 to 1934 new passenger-car registrations on farms and in towns under 10,000 in population increased 40 percent, whereas in cities over 10,000 the increase was 23 percent.

New automobile purchases, among other things, have meant an increased gasoline consumption.

Consumption in Ohio rose from 886,640,000 gallons in 1933 to 955,470,000 gallons in 1934 and to 1,014,926,000 gallons in 1935.

From 1933 to 1935 the increase amounted to 14 percent.

Increased sales of new, ordinary life insurance in Ohio have been another indication of bettered conditions.

The value of sales for 1935 aggregated \$370,114,000, an increase of 13 percent over the 1933 figure of \$328,910,000.

Improved banking conditions are further indications of increased business activity.

Monthly statements issued by the Federal Reserve System indicate that debits to individual accounts increased greatly from 1932 to 1935.

For 1932 debits in the Cleveland district amounted to \$15,427,413,000, and for 1934 they rose to \$16,474,873,000.

Preliminary figures indicate that for 1935 they increased to \$19,028,067,000, or 23 percent over the 1932 figure.

Savings, including time deposits and postal savings deposited in banks in Ohio, aggregated \$895,105,000, an advance of \$113,890,000, or 15 percent for the year closing June 29, 1935, in comparison with the year ending June 30, 1933, according to reports received by the savings division, American Bankers Association.

A recent study of freight waybills on carlot shipments of industrial products over 4 railroads, from 16 industrial States of the Northeast to 10 agricultural States of the Southeast, shows that shipments in the year ending June 30, 1934, were greater by 816,302,238 pounds, or 38.8 percent than in the preceding 12 months.

Shipments from the State of Ohio, excluding coal, totaled 316,716,439 pounds in the year ending June 30, 1933, whereas during the following year ending June 30, 1934, after the farm program and other recovery measures went into effect, the total was 417,633,148 pounds, an increase of 48.9 percent.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] may be permitted to address the House tomorrow, but the request was objected to. I notice that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has received permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow. I therefore renew my request that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] may have 10 minutes to address the House after the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], and that following the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] I may have 10 minutes in which to address the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask the gentleman to present that request a little later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order, the gentleman from Montana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I admonish you and the Members of the House that nothing I shall say is to be interpreted to mean that I am not in favor of the three

branches of Government as provided in the Constitution. I believe in the Constitution and in the operation of the three branches of Government as provided by it. However, Mr. Speaker, the invalidating of New York's minimum-wage law by the Supreme Court of the United States yesterday was so far reaching that it presents a new issue for the people of these United States.

Some 2 weeks ago the Supreme Court decided in the Guffey coal case that the Congress had no authority to regulate wages in undertakings pertaining to States only, and in yesterday's case denied the States such rights.

Now, without discussing the merits or demerits of either case, but just the principles of law laid down, where is labor under this condition of affairs so far as those two decisions are concerned?

In the first instance the Court invoked the rule of States' rights, and in the second instance it invokes the "due process of law" clause.

Now, with these two decisions confronting us, labor's left leg is knocked out if it does and its right leg is knocked out if it does not. So, with both of these decisions and without a constitutional amendment, labor is flat on its back and at the mercy of its exploiters.

This condition forces upon the people of this Nation the constitutional-amendment issue at this time.

With this decision yesterday holding that the States cannot regulate, right on the heels of the Guffey coal case holding that the Congress cannot regulate, organized labor generally throughout the Nation, and especially in the States having regulatory, minimum hours, maximum hours, age limits, and minimum-wage laws, took a blow that can only be corrected by a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those who believe that the Constitution can be amended by congressional act. I am a supporter of the Constitution in its every word, and I believe that the only way it can be amended is in accordance with its own terms; that is, by submitting an amendment or amendments to the legislatures of the various States for ratification. That is the issue we are confronted with now. That is the way the drafters of the Constitution made the will of the people supreme.

In my opinion, it is not the Constitution that is at fault, but those who interpret it, and when it is misinterpreted or interpreted contrary to the will of the people and that interpretation becomes the law by judicial decision, then the Constitution provides how the will of the people rather than the whim of a divided court may predominate.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield to the chairman of the Labor Committee.

Mr. CONNERY. I heartily agree with the gentleman, but I should like to call his attention to one fact. The question of licensing corporations in interstate commerce and making them do certain things as a precedent to getting that license has not been acted upon by the Supreme Court. That is the entire basis of the Connery 30-hour-week law.

Mr. AYERS. I agree with the gentleman and thank him for his statement, and as he has always known, I am for his bill. [Applause.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. I agree with a great deal that the gentleman has said, but I do not quite understand his statement that this has now become an issue. I take it the gentleman means a political issue or does he mean an issue between the parties?

Mr. AYERS. No; I mean an issue between the masses of the people of this country, the toilers and those who produce, if you please, all the wealth of this Nation, on the one side, and the predatory interests and the exploiters that are grinding them underfoot on the other side.

Mr. MOTT. Then the gentleman did not mean to infer that the question of amending the Constitution has now become an issue between the Republican and Democratic Parties?

Mr. AYERS. I do not know whether it will become an issue between the Republican and Democratic Parties, but if the Democratic Party which has always fought for the common masses and for the laborers and the toilers and the "under-dogs" of this Nation, does not put a plank of this kind in its platform at Philadelphia, then I say it is up to you Republicans to do it; however, I have faith that the Democrats will do it, because they have always been for the toiling, laboring, and producing masses of this Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman does not suggest that the President or the Democratic Party as yet has suggested such an amendment to the Constitution as an issue.

Mr. AYERS. I will say to my friend from Oregon that I am suggesting it now as an issue, and I am pitting the Democratic Party as the friend of the masses.

The phrase in the Constitution upon which the Court's five-member opinion is based reads as follows: "Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." This five-member decision held that the right of the employees to bargain with their employer is a violation of the liberty guaranteed to the employer under this "due process" clause.

Did you ever hear of a judicial interpretation going that far? This is the issue that we are confronted with. The Court has made the issue. Blowing hot and cold on the same subject at the same time made the issue. The reasoning of the two decisions is not consistent.

I just cannot see it. Four of the members of that Court could not see it either, and surely the great masses of this country will be unable to see it. They may look until doomsday and yet they never will see how so much was read into the four words, "due process of law."

So far as the requirements of "due process" are concerned, and in the absence of other constitutional restrictions, a State surely is free to adopt whatever economic policy may reasonably be deemed to promote public welfare, and to enforce that policy by legislation adopted for that purpose. If State laws passed have a reasonable relation to a proper legislative purpose, and are neither arbitrary nor discriminatory, the requirements of the "due process" provision are satisfied.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I am glad to again yield to my friend from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Labor Committee.

Mr. CONNERY. Was it not a rather sharp indictment of the Court when Justice Stone at least implied that the economic opinions of the majority members of the Court were swaying their decision rather than their legal opinion in the matter?

Mr. AYERS. It surely was, and Justice Stone's dissenting opinion was concurred in by Chief Justice Hughes in a special dissenting opinion, and also by two other Justices of the Supreme Court. You know this was a 5-to-4 decision.

In my State—Montana—we have regulatory laws and maximum-hour statutes which, by this 5-to-4 decision, are in jeopardy. If the Supreme Court can nullify minimums it can nullify maximums and other regulatory laws. The same condition exists in all other States having such laws.

In addition to these State laws this Congress and the last Congress wrote into many acts regulatory provisions, prevailing-wage scales, and the collective-bargaining clause, all of which, by these two decisions, have and will come to naught. In each instance I am proud to have supported and voted for each regulatory provision, each prevailing-wage scale provision, and each collective-bargaining clause. I know the good that they have done and I know the good that they can and will do, and I am not willing to assume that labor in general, and organized labor in particular, in the Nation and in the States is whipped. I believe that the friends of the toilers of this Nation will organize at once and demand a constitutional amendment making all such laws possible and effective. [Applause.]

The President has at all times stood firmly for the rights of the toilers, the laborers, and the producers of this Nation.

The Democratic Party has always been for them, and I feel that in its national convention at Philadelphia, that great party of the people will adopt a resolution demanding a constitutional amendment whereby these great humanitarian laws may be reenacted.

The time is ripe. The great rank and file of the people demand it, and since the Democratic Party has always been the party of the people and not a party of the interests, let us progress as usual, for the interest of the people. [Applause.]

Labor should have the right to collectively bargain; the right to these wage scales; the right to hour limitations; the right to protect women and children from the sweatshop, and the right generally to protect all laborers from exploiters. So now that the death knell has been rung, let us, the Democratic Party, go forward in an orderly manner and correct the wrong with a constitutional amendment. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman realizes that yesterday we had a program for today which included the Private Calendar and some rules. We have lost an hour today, and yesterday we objected to the request of other Members who wanted to speak today. I hope the gentleman will defer his request.

Mr. HOUSTON. I made the request for yesterday and then put it off until today.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman's request is granted, there will be other similar requests, and I am sure the gentleman from Kansas, as well as other Members, are interested in the rules that are to be called up.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

THE NATIONAL YEOMEN F

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1687) to incorporate The National Yeomen F.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Massachusetts explain what the bill does?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes. The report of the Committee on the District of Columbia is very short, and states:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1687) to incorporate The National Yeomen F, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

Members of the organization which is seeking this national charter were the first women in history to enter the armed forces of our country in time of war, and it seems fitting that Congress should give them the recognition conferred by the provisions of the bill here reported.

The Yeomen F are entitled to all the benefits of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to the bonus and things of that sort, that goes with being sworn into the military service of the United States, and they simply want to be incorporated just as the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, may we have the bill read?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Eva H. Clarke, Beatrice Brown Dwyer, and Mary J. O'Donnell, of Arizona;

Ruby Busse Anglim, Lottie Sessions Barrett, Philome Lucy Cavanaugh, Stella Austen Clark, Pearl Bonham Clerk, Lillian Koeber Deamer, Harriet Jane Dodson, Alma Simmermacher Dreyer, Stella Neumann Elbersen, Ola Belle Emmmer, Edna Crumpler Estes, Miriam Mathews Everett, Katherine Driscoll Fallon, Kathleen Vance Hatch, Eva Wilson Hay, Ellen Keefe Heady, Ruth Hemphill, Myrtle Kinsey, Anna Geisler Kirkpatrick, Katherine Brown Lightner, Margaret Dannagier Lovelace, Lillian Catherine McCarthy, Gladys Farmer McCool, Laura Landes Metcalf, Louise Vickery Mowers, Ruth Manahan Neal, Gladys D. Nelson, Madeline O'Leary Peggs, Caroline Peirce, Sara Craddock Sasser, May Gesner Schaefer, Billie Browne Schank, Rita Beauton Schaub, Etienne V. Schier, Louise Williams Sears, Anne Williams Shumway, Florence Kelly Sparrow, Laura V. Waldron, Agnes L. Walker, Gladys Spaulding Wheelless, Evelyn Lyon Wiberg, and Muriel Andrews Zerangue, all of California;

Gladys Yeager Briggs and Blanche Marion Curry, of Colorado; Grace Pascoe Agard, Julie Sternberg Aichler, Mary Sweeney Alling, Sara Hinchey Barry, Anna Kilroy Bean, Kathleen Moriarty

Begley, Anna Lyons Bergin, Ethel Cornet Bolles, Anna McDowell Brown, Mary MacKenzie Carson, Lucy Galvin Cavanaugh, Rose Reiger Chapman, Dorothy Sara Clifford, Monica Cecelia Clifford, Sadie Connelly, Marjory Murray Cormack, Martha Swirsky Cotton, Marion McEntee Cox, Ione Disco Cunningham, Katherine Lyng Donovan, Margaret Bess Dordelman, Marguerite Driscoll, Mae Sheehan Dwyer, Ruth Lawson Euster, Katherine Frances Fagan, Ethel Clendenen Fargo, Gertrude Selesnitzky Feinberg, Elisabeth Tagliabue Fields, Helen Buckley Fitzgerald, Irene Catherine Fitzgerald, Anna Campbell Forsythe, Anna J. Gaughan, Mary Penders Gillis, Mary Agnes Grady, Theresa Madeleine Hamill, Alice Mary Harrington, Florence Hulbert Hermanus, Ella Veronica Houlihan, Deborah Pickett Kane, Frances Walsh Keenan, Margaret O'Brien Kennedy, Hazel Merwin Lander, Elizabeth Mallon Leighton, Agnes Carlson Lukens, Catherine Gertrude MacKenzie, Clara Armstrong MacKenzie, Edna Murray Manchester, Mary Driscoll Markham, A. Regina Martin, Josephine McAuliffe Martin, Bellerose Meunier, Mazie Rogers Miller, Elsie Reichert Moon, Winnifred Patricia Nagle, Isabelle Dickson Peterson, Lucy Riley Pfannenstiel, Jewel Perkins Pitt, Eleanor Donahoe Reilly, Elizabeth Kepes Reynolds, Ida Reed Sanders, Alice Savage, Mildred Mabel Schwartz, Margaret Hogan Seaman, Ida Selesnitzky Stone, Augusta Strand, Caroline Wyllie Waterman, Juliana Augusta Weske, Helen Wienhusen, Louise Arnold Wiley, Selina Lee Winter, Margaret Hardiman Wrisley, Mary Connors Wundrack, and Marie Deering Yeager, all of Connecticut;

Norma M. Albers, Lucille Loveless Allan, Gladys Elizabeth Allen, Sarah Jarvis Andrus, Edith Ober Armstrong, Mary Hough Barber, May A. Barrett, Nettie Neltzzy Beach, Mary Munday Becker, Esther Hall Beckett, Anne Curtin Belt, Charlotte Louise Berry, Jeannette L. Bishop, Alice Boland Bloomfield, Amelia Boberg, Beulah Holtzschelter Bosworth, Jane M. Breen, Kate Knight Briggs, Eloise Broadbuss, Helen Sprague Brown, Lola Carlisle Strallman Browning, Rose Flood Buice, Annette Louise Burton, Gertrude Bange Butts, Mary Callen, Daisy House Campbell, Ella Echols Chambers, Emma S. Collie, Maude V. Cowan, Jane Regina Cox, Catherine Crowley, Reva S. Darrell, F. Pearl Delaplaine, Eleanor Marie Downey, Alice M. Downie, Cora Laughlin Drake, Anna Cecelia Dunn, Emma Schroder Dyer, Bessie London Faine, Elizabeth Waters Fallis, Anna Schultz Frame, Barbara Spence French, Agnes Monia Gallagher, Annie Ellen Gilson, Eleanor Mary Griffith, Mary Derouda Hall, Amy F. Hammond, Adelaide Ruth Harbers, Dorothy B. Harper, Carolyn Hardesty Herman, Nellie Grant Hinson, Mary E. Jones, Claire Keefe, Kathryn Gallagher Kendrick, Ann Kilmartin, Hope Knickerbocker, Louise Elender Koester, Mary Beall Kolhos, Helen Lucinda Leonard, Edith Kite Lewis, Mary Dove Loughrey, Marie B. Luebker, Lillian Allen Brubaker Luther, Helen Horgan Maisel, Laura Garcia Martin, Louise Greenwald Matthews, Helen C. McCarty, Geraldine Clark McGovern, Lois B. McRae, Ellen Russell McWilliams, Eloise Sanford Davison Miller, Mary Kurth Moler, Alice Alford Morgan, Anna Lochte Murphy, Margaret Elma Naylor, Edna Meier Nielson, Margaret Broderick Nolan, Alice F. O'Neal, Helen Geraldine O'Neill, Helen Linkins Opitz, Netty Baxter Parker, Blanche C. Paul, Anna Viola Phelps, Annie Skidmore Powers, Sue Gould Prentiss, Edith Warren Quinn, Lillian Louise Reagan, Edna Marie Robey, Estelle Richardson Ruby, Ethel Clark Rule, Louise MacDonnell Ryan, Elizabeth Ivey Sage, Marion Trumbo Skinner, Jessica Randolph Smith, Margaret Grady Smith, Mabel F. Staub, Emily Steele, Nellie Rollins Stein, Edith Herndon Summerson, Mary Sullivan Tatspaugh, Marion Crawford Thur, Mary Killilea Tracey, Margaret Mills Vaughan, Eva Young Virtue, Olive Wrenn Walter, Genevieve F. Wedding, Mary Z. Weide, Lena Kathryn Willge, Pansie Casanave Willson, Ethel M. Wilson, Faith Clements Windsor, Amy Owen Wood, Lena Rigby Woolford, Myrtle Stephens Wright, and Mary Crook Yates, all of the District of Columbia;

Marie Roberts Bevis, Zella Prunty Byrd, Lamonte Oliver Cates, Demerise Labbe Cleveland, Ida Matthews Eichenberger, Loyce Davis Hackett, Mabel Williamson Jacobs, Madeline A. Jacobson, Idele Torrance Jamison, Adele Mead Kendrick, Josephine Mack Miller, Lois Clappison Morse, Almeda Fink Murphy, Roxana Anne Post, Agnes Towson Shelton, Daisy Ruth Westerlund, and Elsie Tuttle Wright, all of Florida;

Anna Elizabeth O'Connell, of Georgia;

Alta Seebree Wardwell Donovan, of Idaho;

Elsie Ericksen Biever, Nora Pomeroy Darling, Grace Alma Dunbar, Anne Rourke Durst, Virginia Stoddert Moore Grottee, Nell Weston Halstead, Edna Benton Hann, Cornelia M. Huennekens, Elizabeth Ann McCoy, Mary Louise Minton, Josephine MacFarland Moran, Mable Vander Ploeg Pease, Hester Smith Rasmussen, Agnes Foertsch Rohlfing, Marie Healy Simpson, Evelyn Jackson Skavlan, Constance Strong, and May Gilligan Sutherland, all of Illinois;

Donna Zimmer Akin, Bessie Fisher Bogwell, Hortense Lee Goldsmith, Mary Parker Harris, and Minnie Tryon Ryan, all of Indiana;

Maud Lowell Ayers, of Kentucky;

Sarah Flaherty Gallagher and Gladys Ilsley McKnight, of Maine; L. Dorothy Devey Brunken, Lucille Bonita Garrett, Fannie Grigat Laut, Grace Ryder Mead, Katherine Marie Page, Lillian Peters Tabor, Effie Van Horn Thomas, Edna Josephine Yorker, and Anna Kaer Yust, all of Maryland;

Mary Lee Aylward, Marion L. Bain, Florence K. Barry, Anna E. Beers, Helen I. Blake, Mary C. Breslow, Adelaide Mary Bresnahan, Gladys Bruce, Isabel Kehoe Burk, Aileen J. Burke, Elizabeth Helen Burke, Dorothy Leighton Cady, Alice Elinor Carey, Helen Carman, Mary A. Carroll, Mary Chisel, Mary Warner Colombo, Mazie Conley, Kathryn J. Connor, Anita Ryan Connors, Mary M. Conroy, Ellen Bernadette Corbett, Catherine A. Corcoran, Winifred Burns Cox,

Lizzie Glidden Crowley, Madeleine Galvin Delano, Elinor Kyle Devine, Sally Ryan Devlin, Mary F. Doherty, Jane E. Dolsen, Mary Dowd, Eleanor Marion Drew, Alice Driscoll, Mary Joyce Duggan, Mollie Catherine Dundon, Margaret Murphy Faherty, Helen Farrell, Helen Mary Farrell, Catherine Woodward Feeney, Bernice W. Fortin, Patricia Gleason, Marion E. Grady, Mary E. Grady, Anna Mary Hegarty, Ethel Hickey, Dorothy Drew Horan, Elizabeth A. Horgan, Marie Lambert Johnson, Anna Riley Joyce, Agnes Keaneally, Ellen E. Kearns, Bessie Josephine Kelly, Violet Elizabeth Kirkland, Ethel Lally, Genevieve Adrienne Lane, Lucy Marshall Lanigan, Ellen A. Lannigan, Leonore Learson, Julia B. Lehan, Marie Alice Long, Gertrude Lorton, Emma Macaulay Lyle, Helen Stolba Macbeth, Gertrude Catherine Macdonald, Margaret Mehlman Maguire, Anna Marie Mahan, Genevieve A. Maher, Mary Louise Marcille, Marie Kathryn McAuliffe, Anna McCarthy, Helen F. McDonald, Catherine McDonough, Marion Mary McElaney, Anna Marie McGuire, Esther McCall McLaughlin, Agnes Murphy McLean, Anna L. McNulty, Ruth Desmond McDweeney, Bertha Erickson Mead, Irene Florence Michel, Yvonne Michel, Margaret Isabelle Mitchell, Margaret Louise Murphy, Helen Adelaide Murray, Elizabeth McDonald Myers, Helen Barr Nickerson, Eleanor Teresa O'Brien, Margaret Catherine O'Brien, Rita Minehan O'Brien, Margaret Lonergan O'Brien, Helen O'Brien O'Connor, Elizabeth M. O'Donnell, Mary Bull Owens, Olive T. Parsons, Mary Fielding Rawling, Mary McGunigle Redmond, Elizabeth Foley Regan, Mary Lane Regan, Ellen Riley, Helen O'Brien Riley, Anita Roberts, Mary Myers Robinson, Alice Mahan Saunders, Gladys Mary Saxton, Mary Elizabeth Scalley, Julia E. Shine, Elizabeth Stander, Mary Catherine Sughruue, Madeline O'Brien Sullivan, Harriet Mussinan Swearingen, Mary Gross Thayer, Grace M. Tomasello, Madeline Robillard Treloar, Isabel Catherine Wall, Lulu Veronica Walsh, Ethel May Ward, Agnes O'Brien Welch, Esther Marie Werme, Margaret Gertrude Wholly, Alice M. Williams, Lillian Everette Williams, Lucy M. Winn, and Maud C. Young, all of Massachusetts;

Theresa Bean Ballenger, Lilla Mary Bellinger, Gertrude M. Camp, Pauline Cassidy, Grace Schoenhur Conway, Marie Rossley Kalt, Gladys Webster Mallett, Helen Moran, and Margaret Morton Mullaney, all of Michigan;

Ethyl Ryan Maly and Gertrude O'Connor Trestrail, of Minnesota;

Gladys Thames Hubbard, of Mississippi;
Sophie Polenska Coleman, of Missouri;
Davidson, Edyth Plummer, and Dorothy Mauck Wehrman, of Nebraska;

Christina Sander Anderson, Anna Elizabeth Conroy, Gertrude O'Neil DeBrunner, A. May Erwin, Alice Catherine Fairbrother, Kathleen Mary Field, Anne Pedersen Freeman, Marguerite B. Geiger, Lillian Helena Hannold, Julia Hicks, Anna V. Kane, Dorothy May Lee, Corrine Dextroze Mahanna, Ann Marie McCormick, Mina Klein Morrison, Marie Burke Oetmann, Ann B. Shinick, and Catherine Waters, all of New Jersey;

Sarah Russell Imhof, of New Mexico;

Mary Dukey Archer, Laura Dayton Ball, Esther Berkowitz, Rose Brancato Biagi, May Anne Blazina, Ruth Nethaway Bouck, Harriet Eldridge Robins Brandt, Josephine Mitchell Brosseau, Irene Malito Brown, Regina Burke, Frances Pedicks Campbell, Rowena Margaret Campbell, May Flaherty Carroll, Veronica Marie Cherry, Mary L. Clark, May Cecilia Collins, Ada Howe-Webster Dallinger, Julia Flynn Dorner, Alice Leahy Everard, Dorothy Winifred Ferrier, Elinor Valentine Foley, Marie McElroy Forte, Anna Gallagher, Margaret Katherine Garland, Florence Wilson Goulden, Alice Miriam Govenor, Elizabeth Anna Gridley, Mildred Berryman Hall, Mary Mahoney, Halwartz, S. Dorothy First Hayes, Alice Gieseking Johnson, Angela Lyons Johnson, Marie Elizabeth Kelly, Carrie Klingner, Leonore Lawson Koellstedt, Lucile Alzamora Lacey, Mary Gray Langford, Esther Martins Law, Hortense Lersner, Gertrude Long, Isabel Margaret Lynch, Nellie Mahoney, Ruth Evelyn Manning, Matilda Foeth McDonald, Agnes Murphy McGovern, Mary McMahon, Lillian Forsberg Miller, Maud Amelia Mittern, Blanche Babbitt Moeller, Frances Donahue Molloy, Mina Walden Mullen, Lulu Muller, Mary Elizabeth Noel, Lillie May Nohowec, Mabel Dorothy O'Connell, Betty A. Peifer, Frances L. Phair, Anna Reisman, Julia White Robbins, Marion Flannery Savage, Gertrude Evelyn Sawyer, Margaret Flagion Schutt, Mae E. Shuttleworth, Ethel Lynwood Sickles, M. Grace Siegmann, Alice Clyde Stafford, Jeannette Gartland Sturla, May Agnes Sullivan, Lillian Browne Swanson, Dorothy Bradford Thomson, Irene M. Tynan, Rita Regan Wallis, Florence Kelley Walters, Irene Hallan Webb, Julia Woodroff Wheelock, Sally R. Wolf, Sarah Gibbon Yeoman, and Henrietta Yunker, all of New York;

Cooper Miller Correll, Willa Tritt Coward, Virginia Dockery Crow, Lassie Kelly Cunningham, Ethel Harwood Fuller, Estelle D. Gordon, Velma Moody Horne, Annie L. Londeree, Arabella Johnson Milligan, Rebecca Adams Nichols, Mary Allen Pearce, Kathleen Rogers Tate, and Edith Singer Weibel, all of North Carolina;

Netta Russell Christian, Evelyn Evans, Mary Pow Hartman, and Mae E. Hickey, all of Ohio;

Helen Jane Bringer and Bessie Hittle Groff, of Oklahoma;

Anna Lenz Seaton and Evelyn B. Youngs, of Oregon;

Marie R. Ahern, Mary Kemp Anthony, Laura Anderson, Sue Rohland Arishoff, Lillian Young Armour, Minnetta Collier Bentz, Lillian LeVene Blackman, Maybelle M. Bond, Anna D. Boyle, Gertrude Margaret Bracken, Winifred Brooks, May McCormick Bullock, Emma Engel Bunte, Margaret Rebecca Burdell, Mary Gallagher Campbell, Margaret M. Collins, Mae McConnell Conlin, Mary E. Cross, Mrs. James Crumlish, Anna Maguire Culliton, Mary Cavanaugh Daly, Claire Dougherty Dever, Helen M. Devery, Anna Marie

Devine, Elizabeth Gray Doran, Helen Dunne, Helen Coty Easterby, Anna Viola Edmonds, Dorothy Elma Evans, Florence Monberger Fedor, Sylvania Israel Garner, M. Cecilia Geiger, Gertrude White Gilkes, Fanny Goldscheider, Blanche Miller Grimes, Catherine Stanfield Gutenbergberger, Emily Hacker, Beatrice B. Hamer, Agnes E. Hamill, Marion Manahan Hammill, Claire V. Harkins, Bertha M. Harris, Mary English Harvey, Freda Forster Hawsey, Kathryn Johnston Hazzard, Charlotte King Hedden, Jane Orr Heilig, S. Elizabeth Holmes, Effie C. Innes, Sue Altemus Jones, Anna Elizabeth Jourdan, Marie A. Kelly, Marie V. Klase, Emma Edith Lapeus, Sophia Levin, Mary M. Long, Laura Harrison Love, Anna Elizabeth Magee, Helen Marshall, Esther Nichols Martin, Cecilia McHale, Elizabeth Marie McNamee, Anna J. Meara, Mary Burton Morris, Rosaline K. Moscony, Helen Hannigan Myers, Sara Myers, Florence Fischer Nicholson, Vesta Kaufman Niedt, Sylvania W. Oberholtzer, Anna Florence O'Connor, Constance O'Hara, Catharine G. O'Neill, Margaret Elizabeth Paul, Anne M. Perry, Cora Felter Phillips, Molly Dever Purcell, Mary A. Raith, Sara Ada Rice, Isabel E. Rosenfeldt, Anna M. Ross, Lillian White Schumacher, Prudence McCullin Sheperla, Rachel Emily Shultz, Aida Holz Skelly, Mabel Melville Slifer, Marjorie L. Slocum, Mary T. Smith, Caroline Steinbock, Mary M. Taylor, Agnes Finley Tieinan, Ida Carver Townsend, Gertrude Martin Voigt, Katherine Frances Walsh, Mary Warren, Elsie E. Weaver, Amy Maria Weems, Annette Kirby Weirbach, Margaret Rowena Wellbank, Joanna Ferguson Wittman, and Elsie Richards Whitmore, all of Pennsylvania.

Jennie Carter Aldred, Elisabeth Louise Baxter, Lydia York Brown, Lillian Annette Callis, Lillie Reeves Campbell, Olive Mather Clark, Theresa Margaret Dunphy, Helen MacDonald Garnett, Matilda Eglinton Grady, Dora Bucklin Helwig, Catherine Freeman Hunt, Monica Monaghan Keenan, Margaret Ruane McCartin, Effie Crowther Meeker, Mary Littlefield O'Mara, Jennie Cavanaugh Peffer, and Agnes Wheeler Smith, all of Rhode Island;

Bertha Avaunt Frischkorn, Sara Quinn Harrington, Rosa Wade Holland, Florence Idella Larasey, Mary Sinkler de Saussure McQueen, Ida Marie Stoesen, and Mamie Elizabeth Verdier, all of South Carolina;

Antonio Shuster Bunker, Sue Lou Rutledge Corbin, and Louisa Daniell Shepherd, all of Texas;

Esther Laubach, of Utah;

Nellie Leland Cutler and Minnie Bliss Sweetser, of Vermont;

Bertha Tyler Carwithen, Columbia Taylor Conway, Mary Anne Eike, Janet Rishell English, Dorothy Knight Fannon, Pauline Taylor Groves, Peggy Oakes Marable, Ethel Ward Montagne, Rose Nelson O'Hara, Anna Smith Reynolds, Josephine M. Senerchia, Maude Lois Smith, Mayme E. Smith, Mary Phillips Spiers, Margaret C. Thomas, and Ulla Rathbun Tracy, all of Virginia;

Sadie Conely Babcock, Margaret Powell Bidlake, Calla Layton Henly, Betty L. Reynolds, Emma Rogers Shriver, Lillian M. Squier, and Agnes Bell Williams, all of Washington;

Elsie Jane Beaty, Beulah Bess Carper, Ada Drown Childers, Mabelle W. Clinton, Alberta Herren Davis, Selma Price Deyo, Cora Byrnside Haynes, Mabel Claire Heslep, Hazel Hodge, Pauline Miller Howard, Tillie Haley Hull, Elizabeth Van Hoose Hurt, Helen Southworth Lanterman, Hope Parker Oesterle, Naoma Hawkes Parsons, Mary Louise Price, Kathaleen Dellinger Ridgley, and Wafie Calabaugh Robinson, all of West Virginia;

Mrs. Wallace A. Giffen, Laura V. Hall, Eleanor Walters Herdrich, Ada Hosford, and Sophia Keller Ormond, all of Wisconsin;

Susan Barnes Turney, of Wyoming;

Wilhelmina Mezger Farvin Woofter, of Alaska;

Katherine Patee MacMillan, of Canada;

Rose O'Connell Shaefer, of China;

Laura Finnegan Cheatham, Margaret MacEachern Edwards, Marie Murray Grant, Lillian Cooper Harrington, and Julia Weber, all of Hawaii;

and their associates and successors are hereby created a body corporate and politic, in the District of Columbia, by the name of "The National Yeomen F", for patriotic, historical, and educational purposes; to foster and perpetuate the memory of the service of Yeomen (f) in the United States Naval Reserve Force of the United States Navy during the World War; to preserve the memories and incidents of their association in the World War by the encouragement of historical research concerning the service of Yeomen (f); by the promotion of celebrations of all patriotic anniversaries to cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom; to foster true patriotism and love of country, and to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty.

Sec. 2. That said organization is authorized to hold real and personal estate in the United States so far only as may be necessary to its lawful ends, to an amount not exceeding \$50,000, and may adopt a constitution and bylaws not inconsistent with law, and may adopt a seal.

Sec. 3. That said organization shall report annually to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concerning its proceedings, and said Secretary shall communicate to Congress such portions thereof as he may deem of national interest and importance. The regents of the Smithsonian Institution are authorized to permit said national organization to deposit its collections, manuscripts, books, pamphlets, and other material for history in the Smithsonian Institution or in the National Museum, at their discretion, upon such conditions and under such rules as they shall prescribe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL GOLD MEDAL TO LINCOLN ELLSWORTH

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. 3770, to award a special gold medal to Lincoln Ellsworth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state what this bill is?

Mr. PARSONS. It is a bill authorizing a special gold medal to Lincoln Ellsworth for his discovery of new land in the Antarctic region. It has been reported unanimously by the committee, with an amendment to the Senate bill correcting the language.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the President of the United States is authorized to present a gold medal of appropriate design, with accompanying distinctive ribbon, to Lincoln Ellsworth, noted American explorer and outstanding pioneer in exploratory aviation in the Arctic and in Antarctica, for claiming on behalf of the United States approximately 350,000 square miles of land in Antarctica between the eightieth and one hundred and twentieth meridians west of Greenwich, representing the last unclaimed territory in the world, and for his exceptionally meritorious services to science and aeronautics in making a 2,500-mile aerial survey of the heart of Antarctica, thus paving the way for more detailed studies of geological, meteorological, and geographical questions of world-wide importance and benefit. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REFORESTATION

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend the act entitled "An act to insure adequate supplies of timber and other forest products for the people of the United States, to promote the full use, for timber growing and other purposes, of forest lands in the United States, including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correlation and the most economical conduct of forest research in the Department of Agriculture, through research in reforestation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related subjects, and for other purposes", approved May 22, 1928.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Reserving the right to object, I dislike to make a point of order, but the rule provides that the Private Calendar shall be taken up today immediately after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and the conclusion of the special orders. It seems to me out of order to take this bill up at this time. Many Members are away from the Chamber and have the right to assume that nothing but private bills will be taken up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was this bill on the Consent Calendar yesterday?

Mr. LUCKEY. Yes; but it was not reached. It is at the end of the calendar and cannot be reached at this session.

This bill simply provides for a reclassification of the forestry stations. At present there are 12, and this reorganization will make 13. It is a bill that is sponsored by the Agricultural Department, the Forest Department and has the endorsement of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. How much will it cost?

Mr. LUCKEY. There is no appropriation called for at all. It reclassifies the Forestry Divisions or experiment stations.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It makes a new station.

Mr. LUCKEY. It is a reclassification; it calls for no money at this time.

Mr. MAPES. Has the gentleman consulted the ranking member of the committee as to calling it up?

Mr. LUCKEY. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. And he knows that the gentleman intends to call it up?

Mr. LUCKEY. He is in favor of it; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 699; U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 16, sec. 581a), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to establish and maintain a forest experiment station in the Great Plains and prairie States, to be known as the "Great Plains Forest Experiment Station", and to acquire by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise such real property or interest therein as in his judgment is required for the use of said station, including the making of necessary expenditures in examining, appraising, and surveying any such property and in doing all things incident to perfecting title thereto in the United States. There is authorized to be appropriated annually such additional sums as may be required for the purposes of this paragraph."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO SOLANO COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 10356, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to convey a right-of-way over certain lands situated in Solano County, Calif., to the State of California for State highway purposes. This bill was on the Consent Calendar yesterday, it is approved by the gentlemen in charge of calendar on either side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the committee amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That there is hereby granted to the State of California, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, an easement of right-of-way for highway purposes only and for no other purposes, over a strip of land 150 feet in width and lying and being 75 feet on either side of the center line of a certain privately operated toll road known as the Sears Point Toll Road, as said road is now laid out, used, and operated, and running from the Napa River in the county of Solano, State of California, to Sonoma Creek in said county and State.

"Said grant is for the purpose of permitting the State of California to locate and maintain at its expense along the route hereinbefore mentioned a free public highway, which shall be a portion of the State highway system of the State of California. *Provided, however,* That upon abandonment of said highway by the State of California for the purposes aforesaid the easement granted to the said State of California under this act shall cease and terminate.

"Sec. 2. Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy or his duly authorized representative it is necessary or desirable, he may, in behalf of the United States, assume for a temporary period exclusive control, management, and regulation of the use for any purpose of said highway; or the Secretary of the Navy may, in behalf of the United States, at any time he deems the interests of the United States so require, permanently terminate such easement on the whole or any part of the said lands, and thereupon all rights hereby granted to the State of California shall terminate forever. Upon a permanent termination of the said easement by the act of the Secretary of the Navy, the United States shall thereafter pay to the State of California the reasonable value of the highway improvements constructed by the State of California on the land described herein and upon said right-of-way at the time of such termination, such value to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to execute and deliver to the State of California such conveyance as is necessary to effectuate the terms of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to; and the bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, it is now 3 o'clock, and we have been waiting 3 hours for the call of the Private Calendar. I feel I shall have to object to any further addresses or to the bringing up of any more bills at this time.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12624, the first deficiency appropriation bill, together with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate; also that the managers on the part of the House, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XX, be authorized to agree to any and all Senate amendments, with or without amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12624, the first deficiency appropriation bill, together with the amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate; also that the managers on the part of the House, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XX, be authorized to agree to any Senate amendments, with or without amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I would be willing myself to agree to a complete report on everything except certain projects. There are certain projects in that bill which I think should come back for a separate vote in the House. For instance, there is the Florida ship canal proposition, then the public-works revolving fund proposition, and the reclamation projects item. I would not want to agree to a complete report without that reservation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, as to the first two, amendments 41 and 49, I should be willing to bring them back to the House. These others involving a whole raft of amendments, under the reclamation law, can easily be rejected by the managers on the part of the House, and not over one or two, perhaps not one, included in the report if it is authorized by law. If it is not authorized by law, we will be compelled to bring it back to the House, anyway, under the rules of the House. I shall agree to bring the other two back for a vote.

Mr. TABER. I think the reclamation project items for the time being should be reserved.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, for the time being I object to the last part of the request, which waives the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman would not object to the bill going to conference?

Mr. MAPES. No; I would not object to the bill going to conference.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has objected to the last part of the request. Does that mean that the bill goes to conference?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has abandoned his request, as the Chair understands.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

JAMES PHILIP COYLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 681) for the relief of James Philip Coyle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged sailors James Philip Coyle, who enlisted in the United States Navy on June 16, 1898, as a fireman, second class, serving on the U. S. S. *Franklin* (service no. 122-95-88), shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the naval service of the United States on September 21, 1922: *Provided, That* no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

SEKIGO TAKAHASHI

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 504) to authorize the issuance to Sekigo Takahashi of a permit to reenter the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Labor is authorized and directed to issue to Sekigo Takahashi a permit to reenter the United States after a temporary visit to Japan, notwithstanding his ineligibility for admission for permanent residence, and to readmit him if he applies for readmission during the validity of the permit to reenter.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

DR. HAROLD W. FOGHT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 12622, for the relief of Dr. Harold W. Foght.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there a further objection?

There being no further objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit to Harold W. Foght, superintendent of the Cherokee Indian Agency, N. C., for the sum of \$377.40, which amount was expended from appropriated funds for the transportation of the household effects of Dr. Foght to his new post of duty at Cherokee, N. C.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUTH EDNA REAVIS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4374, for the relief of Ruth Edna Reavis (now Horsley).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the statutory period of entry in the case of Buffalo, Wyo., 030423, Ruth Edna Reavis (now Horsley), is extended 2 years to permit the fulfillment of necessary residence and improvement requirements on the land.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK P. HOYT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1464, for the relief of Frank P. Hoyt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefit upon honorably discharged soldiers Frank P. Hoyt, who was a member of Troop D, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have served for more than 90 days during the Philippine Insurrection and to have been honorably discharged on the 1st day of June 1900: *Provided, That* no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act: *And provided further, That* the rights, privileges, and benefits conferred upon Frank P. Hoyt by reason of the enactment of this act shall be limited to admission to a soldiers' home under the regulations governing such admissions.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. J. WATTS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3067, for the relief of A. J. Watts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there a further objection?

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon persons who have served in the military forces of the United States, the disabilities of A. J. Watts, formerly a private, Battery B, Georgia Volunteer Light Artillery, shall be held and considered to have been incurred by him in the active military service of the United States during the Spanish-American War: *Provided, That* no compensation, retirement pay, back pay, or other benefit shall be held to have accrued by reason of this act prior to its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL YATES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3128, for the relief of Daniel Yates.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. HANCOCK of New York objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommended to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WILLIAM CONNELLY, ALIAS WILLIAM E. CONNOLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3663, for the relief of William Connelly, alias William E. Connoley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers William Connelly, alias William E. Connoley, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, in the Indian wars, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States on May 23, 1883: *Provided*, That no pension, back pay, bounty, or other allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIG. GEN. C. E. NATHORST

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 110, authorizing Brig. Gen. C. E. Nathorst, Philippine Constabulary, retired, to accept such decorations, orders, medals, or presents as have been tendered him by foreign governments.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Brig. Gen. C. E. Nathorst, Philippine Constabulary, retired, be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept such decorations, orders, medals, or presents as have been tendered him by foreign governments.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY—
AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT MEDALS, ORDERS, ETC.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4391, authorizing certain officers and enlisted men of the United States Army to accept such medals, orders, diplomas, decorations, and photographs as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-named officers and enlisted men of the United States Army are hereby authorized to accept such medals, orders, diplomas, decorations, and photographs as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered:

Maj. Gen. George S. Simonds, Maj. Gen. Thomas Q. Ashburn, Brig. Gen. Alfred T. Smith, Lt. Col. Joen E. Ardrey, Lt. Col. David E. Cain, Lt. Col. John A. Considine, Lt. Col. Roland L. Gaugler, Lt. Col. Hans R. W. Herwig, Lt. Col. Dennis E. McCunniff, Lt. Col. Troy H. Middleton, Lt. Col. Lathe B. Row, Lt. Col. Clinton W. Russell, Lt. Col. Otis K. Sadtler, Lt. Col. Clemens W. McMillan, Maj. Elbridge Colby, Maj. Charles H. Corlett, Maj. John A. Weeks, Capt. Robert M. Eichelsdoerfer, and Capt. James H. Walker.

With the following committee amendment:

After line 9, on page 1, insert "Col. Charles H. Morrow (posthumously)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: On page 2, line 11, strike out all of line 11 and insert in lieu thereof "Capt. James H. Walker and Lt. Talliesin Waters."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERCY C. WRIGHT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 12567, for the relief of Percy C. Wright.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLOEB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1769 be substituted for the bill H. R. 12567.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to place First Lt. Percy C. Wright, Army Air Corps Reserve, upon the retired list of the Army with three-fourths of the active-duty pay of his grade: *Provided*, That a duly constituted Army retiring board finds that the said Percy C. Wright is incapacitated for service by reason of physical disability incurred in the line of duty: *Provided further*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BARBARA JAECKEL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4400, for the relief of Barbara Jaeckel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Barbara Jaeckel, widow of Theodore Jaeckel, late consul general, Victoria, British Columbia, the sum of \$8,800, being 1 year's salary of her deceased husband, who died while in the Foreign Service; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST E. DAILEY, DECEASED

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3369, providing for the posthumous appointment of Ernest E. Dailey as a warrant radio electrician, United States Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint, posthumously, Edwin E. Dailey, late a radioman, first class, United States Navy, a warrant radio electrician, United States Navy, and to deliver to the widow of said Edwin E. Dailey the warrant of such appointment. Such appointment shall be effective as of February 11, 1935.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ODA HERBERT PLOWMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 11984, for the relief of Oda Herbert Plowman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to accept for enlistment in the Navy, without regard to physical or other qualifications, Oda Herbert Plowman, formerly chief gunner's mate, United States Navy, in the rating held by him when last discharged therefrom, and to transfer him immediately to the Fleet Naval Reserve in that rating: *Provided*, That the said Oda Herbert Plowman shall be entitled, upon such transfer to the Fleet Naval Reserve, to receive the pay, allowances, and other benefits accorded enlisted men of that rating transferred to the Fleet Naval Reserve after 16 years' service.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. LAURENCE V. HOUSTON, RETIRED

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3992, for the relief of Capt. Laurence V. Houston, retired.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to transfer Capt. Laurence V. Houston from the retired to the active list of the United States Army and to place him on the promotion list in the position he would have occupied had he not been involuntarily transferred to the retired list on December 9, 1929: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall accrue to Capt. Laurence V. Houston by reason of this transfer.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM A. McMAHAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1367, for the relief of William A. McMahan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William A. McMahan, of El Paso, Tex., the sum of \$10,000 for permanent disability resulting from disease contracted in line of duty while in the employ of the Federal Government.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all the wording of the bill after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes', approved September 7, 1916, as amended, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission be, and the same is hereby, authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of William A. McMahan, of El Paso, Tex., for disability alleged to have been incurred by him during the period from September 1923 through February 1924, while in the employment of the Post Office Department as postmaster at Sidon, Ark., and to determine said claim upon its merits under the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months after the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEAN SCOTT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2323, for the relief of Dean Scott.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to grant compensation and medical treatment to Dean Scott for a disability incurred while employed at the Army Transport Pier, Newport News, Va., in July 1914, and as able seaman on the United States ship *A. T. Huckey* at Staten Island, N. Y., in December 1919, such benefits to be granted from the date on which disability began, in accordance with the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of the bill after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes', approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Dean Scott, of Winchester, Mass., and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized to receive and consider his claim, under the remaining provisions of said act, for injury to his right elbow, right side, and his head, alleged to have been sustained while a civilian employee of the United States Army transport *Tacony* on or about December 19, 1919: *Provided*, That claim here-

under shall be made within 6 months after the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I again ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12624, the first deficiency appropriation bill, together with the amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate; also that the managers on the part of the House, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XX, be authorized to agree to any statement with or without amendment. I will except from this request the Florida ship canal and the public-works amendments.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman also include the reclamation projects?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would rather not; there are too many of those.

Mr. TABER. I think we ought to do that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There are too many of those amendments.

Mr. TABER. I think we ought to put the reclamation items in the list, too. That will only make three, nos. 41, 49, and 88.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But my colleague understands there are a great many different projects in that amendment. I do not have any intention of agreeing to those projects, and my colleague knows I have no intention of doing so. There may be one project in the whole list I might agree to, and it may be authorized by law. Why not, then, leave it to the conferees?

Mr. TABER. It would not require a consent to include it in the conference report if it were authorized. I think we ought to except this amendment also, and I shall have to insist on excepting it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TABER. I shall have to object unless the gentleman from Texas will include the reclamation projects in his exceptions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the next bill on the Private Calendar.

INTERNATIONAL-GREAT NORTHERN RAILROAD CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2932, for the relief of the International-Great Northern Railroad Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the International-Great Northern Railroad Co. the sum of \$43,187.54 to compensate the said company for said sum of money for and on account of the United States as paid by the company in the following items: Customs inspection, \$18,600.63; Health Department, \$3,515.74; Department of Agriculture, State of Texas, \$17,630.04; United States Department of Labor, \$3,541.13.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out the wording of the bill after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the claim of the International-Great Northern Railroad Co., for compensation in the amount of \$43,187.54 for expenses and losses incurred and paid to the United States as follows: Customs inspection, \$18,600.63; Health Department, \$3,515.74; United States Department of Labor, \$3,541.13; and to the Department of Agriculture, State of Texas, \$17,630.04, all between September 1929 and

November 1933, on account of salaries and overtime pay of customs and health inspectors, and incidentals in connection therewith and resulting from the inauguration of a new international train service between this country and Mexico. The Court of Claims shall not have jurisdiction under this act unless the said company files a petition setting forth their claims for such compensation in such court within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the International-Great Northern Railroad Co. against the United States."

LUCRETIA NORRIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7822, for the relief of Lucretia Norris.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lucretia Norris the sum of \$600, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained when she was struck by a vehicle operated by an employee of the Government and in the service of the Post Office Department, in Baltimore, Md., on January 1, 1931.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REV. HARRY J. HILL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7947, for the relief of Rev. Harry J. Hill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rev. Harry J. Hill, of Burbank, Calif., the sum of \$500 in full settlement against the Government for damages sustained in a collision between his automobile and a Government-owned truck driven by a Civilian Conservation Corps employee on June 8, 1934, in Yosemite National Park, Calif.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$500" and insert "\$250."

Page 2, line 1, after "California", insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

V. P. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7970, for the relief of V. P. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to V. P. Johnson, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000 to compensate him for loss by fire of motorboat on April 24, 1927, while said boat was leased by the United States Engineers and in the service of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "Johnson", insert "of Vicksburg, Miss."; in line 6, strike out "\$1,000 to compensate him" and insert "\$500 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States"; and in line 10, after the word "States", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. FRANK DALEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8643, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Daley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Frank Daley, of Somers, Mont., the sum of \$21,750. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of their son, Donald Daley, and the serious injuries sustained by the said Mr. and Mrs. Frank Daley when the automobile in which they were riding collided with a truck of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Mr. and Mrs. Frank Daley, of Somers, Mont., the sum of \$21,750. Such sum" and insert "Frank Daley, of Somers, Mont., the sum of \$5,000, and to Mrs. Frank (Margaret E.) Daley the sum of \$2,500. Such sums".

Page 2, line 4, after the words "corps", insert "on October 25, 1934."

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500"; and in line 9, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTELLE MARY MAC DONALD AND MARILYN MAC DONALD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8841, for the relief of Estelle Mary MacDonald and Marilyn MacDonald.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Estelle Mary MacDonald and Marilyn MacDonald, of Chehalis, Lewis County, Wash., a total sum of \$10,920.92, of which amount \$920.92 represents the expenses incurred at the time of the injuries and death of Kenneth Malcolm MacDonald, late husband and father, respectively, of the claimants, Estelle Mary MacDonald and Marilyn MacDonald. Such sum shall be in full settlement of claims against the United States on account of the death of Kenneth Malcolm MacDonald, December 30, 1934, growing out of injuries which occurred December 24, 1934, when an automobile in which he was riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck negligently driven by Joe Flannigan: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$10,920.92" and insert "\$45,920.92."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARBARA JEAN MATTHEWS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8898, for the relief of Barbara Jean Matthews, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Ellen Matthews, guardian of Barbara Jean Matthews, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 in full settlement against the Government for injuries received when her hands were crushed by a falling piano at Yosemite National Park, Camp No. 15, July 24, 1932: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500."

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO to the committee amendment: Strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$1,000."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNIE E. HYLAND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9237, for the relief of Annie E. Hyland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Annie E. Hyland, of San Francisco, Calif., the sum of \$821.40 for injuries sustained on September 4, 1933, when she was struck by an Army fire engine.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "\$821.40" insert "in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States", and in line 9, after "engine", insert a colon and the following:

"Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD L. GOCKLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9418, for the relief of Edward L. Gockler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the requirements of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in the case of Edward L. Gockler, of Saranac Lake, N. Y., formerly employed as

a clerk by the Committee on Public Information, Washington, D. C., and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to consider and act upon any claim filed by him under the provisions of such act, as amended, within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, for compensation for disability resulting from disease contracted by him while in the performance of his duties as such employee, but compensation, if any, shall be paid from and after date of enactment of this act. Such payments of compensation shall be made out of funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the payment of awards under the provisions of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Gockler" and insert "Gockeler"; in line 9, after the word "employed" insert "from September 18, 1917, to January 1, 1918."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "1 year" and insert "6 months"; line 5, strike out "resulting from disease" and insert "alleged to have resulted from tuberculosis" and in line 9, after the word "act" strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW DOWD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9896, for the relief of Andrew Dowd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Andrew Dowd, of Muskegon, Mich., the sum of \$1,800, such sum representing the damages to him caused by injuries sustained in an automobile accident while engaged in the duties of his office as a deputy United States marshal for the western district of Michigan:

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "\$1,800", strike out "such sum representing the" and insert "in settlement of all claims against the United States for"; and in line 11, after the word "Michigan", insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. M. CRAWFORD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 10169, for the relief of L. M. Crawford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to L. M. Crawford the sum of \$66,906.66, as payment for damages sustained by him as a result of the fixing of a boundary line between New Mexico and Texas under a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to L. M. Crawford, of Wichita, Kans., the sum of \$15,281.60, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the loss of 382 acres of land in the Rio Grande Valley about 10 miles northwest of El Paso, Tex., title to which he obtained under a patent issued by the United States to his predecessor in title, and the loss of which resulted from the fixing of the boundary line between the States of New Mexico and Texas by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *State of New Mexico v. Texas* (275 U. S. 279; 48 Sup. Ct. 126): *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SARAH E. PALMER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 10222, for the relief of Sarah E. Palmer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$4,098 in full settlement of all claims against the Government for injuries suffered as the result of her car having been struck by an Army truck in Baltimore on October 10, 1932, and for expenses and losses resulting therefrom: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$4,098" and insert "\$3,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 1, line 4, after the word "pay", insert "to Sarah E. Palmer."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRIS BROS. PLUMBING CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 10527, for the relief of Harris Bros. Plumbing Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Harris Bros. Plumbing Co., St. Paul, Minn., the sum of \$3,150 in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the necessity of employing two additional engineers during the construction of the new post-office building, St. Paul, Minn., September 1933 to September 1934; the Harris Bros. Plumbing Co. having to employ two additional men as assistant engineers for a period of 9 months each at the rate of \$2,100 per annum.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "States", strike out the remainder of page 1 and lines 1, 2, and 3 down to the word "annum" on page 2, and insert: "for the furnishing of additional employees as subcontractor of contract no. T1sa-4352, dated April 5, 1933, during the construction of the new post-office building at St. Paul, Minn., from the period of November 1, 1933, to July 1, 1934, on account of the Government moving into the building prior to its completion and not furnishing sufficient help adequately to heat the building: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORA FULGHUM AND BEN PETERSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 10677, for the relief of Cora Fulghum and Ben Peterson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Cora Fulghum the sum of \$10,000, and to (2) Ben Peterson the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sums to such persons shall be in full settle-

ment of their respective claims against the United States for damages sustained on account of the death of their sons, Arnall Fulghum and C. J. Peterson, respectively, who were fatally injured on August 30, 1935, near Waycross, Ga., in a collision involving the truck on which they were riding and a Government vehicle in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with the said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000", and in line 7, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE HOUSTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 10697, for the relief of George Houston.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of George Houston, who sustained an injury on February 4, 1931, while employed as a rural mail carrier from the post office at Wood Lake, Minn., which resulted in permanent physical disability, and his case is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files a claim for compensation with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the receipt of compensation by the said George Houston under the provisions of this act and such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, shall not prevent his receiving an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "That sections 17 and 20" and insert "That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive."

In line 9, after the word "who", insert "is alleged to have."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "60 days" and insert "6 months", and in line 7, after the word "act", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

Strike out all of section 2.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 11203, for the relief of Andrew Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Andrew Smith, Hot Springs, Ark., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries and damages sustained by Louise Smith, Eula May Smith, and R. L. Smith, minor children of Andrew Smith, when the vehicle in which they were riding was struck, near Hot Springs, Ark., on June 22, 1935, by a vehicle in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,000."

Page 2, after line 2, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATES OF N. G. HARPER AND AMOS PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 11461, for the relief of the estates of N. G. Harper and Amos Phillips.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. F. Watlers, administrator of the estate of N. G. Harper, deceased, and to Sim Phillips, administrator of the estate of Amos Phillips, deceased, the sum of \$1,000 each. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for the death of N. G. Harper and Amos Phillips when the vehicle in which they were riding was struck, on Arkansas State Highway 167, near Sheridan, Ark., November 1, 1934, by a vehicle in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, at the end of the line insert: : *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BROOK HOUSE, LTD., SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11868) for the relief of Brook House, Ltd., of Sydney, Australia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG. I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection?

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Brook House, Ltd., of Sydney, Australia, from the appropriation "34303—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1934", a sum equivalent at the rate of exchange current at the time of payment to £101 8s., Australian currency, in full settlement of its claim against the United States on account of rental of space for the period of July 1 to December 31, 1933, inclusive, in connection with a lease of quarters to the agricultural commissioner of the United States at Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, said lease dated April 17, 1931.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM W. BRUNSWICK

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 522, for the relief of William W. Brunswick.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas William W. Brunswick in 1932 was a member of the United States Foreign Service stationed at Lisbon, Portugal; and

Whereas William W. Brunswick was recalled by the Department of State and returned to the United States before July 1, 1932; and

Whereas some 10 weeks later William W. Brunswick was retired from the Foreign Service; and

Whereas when William W. Brunswick returned to the United States before July 1, 1932, his wife accompanied him, paying her own expenses; and

Whereas the law provides that an officer or clerk shall be entitled to reimbursement for transportation expenses of his family when returning under orders from his post to the United States as provided in paragraph 1, Department of State Supplement to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations dated December 29, 1927: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William W. Brunswick the sum of \$454.12 to reimburse William W. Brunswick for travel expenses for his wife, Evangeline McCarty Brunswick, in returning to the United States from Lisbon, Portugal.

With the following committee amendment:

In the next to the last line on page 1, before the word "law", insert the word "present."

On page 2, line 2, strike out "as provided in paragraph 1, Department of State Supplement to the standardized Government Travel Regulations, dated December 29, 1927" and insert "to remain permanently."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the words "to reimburse William W. Brunswick for" and insert in place thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of."

And at the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA COMMERCIAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3861) for the relief of the Alaska Commercial Co. of San Francisco, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Alaska Commercial Co., of San Francisco, Calif., the sum of \$4,408.21 in full and final settlement of any and all claims against the United States for damages caused to the wharf of said company at Dutch Harbor, Alaska, by the United States Coast Guard cutter *Tahoe*, on May 20, 1934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY L. PARKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 4358) for the relief of Harry L. Parker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 601 of the Merchant Marine Act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 697), the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of Harry L. Parker, of the Department of Agriculture, in a sum not in excess of \$117.48, representing the amount paid by him for transportation on a vessel of foreign registry and per diem in lieu of subsistence while traveling on said vessel, during the period September 7 to 11, 1934.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. D. REED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 4359) for the relief of W. D. Reed.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 601 of the Merchant Marine Act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 697), the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle, out of the available balance in the appropriation "34373.27—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Entomology (household and stored products insects), 1934", the claim of W. D. Reed, of the Department of Agriculture, in the amount of \$220, representing the amount paid by him from personal funds to the Italian Line in settlement for transportation accomplished on a vessel of foreign registry, secured on transportation request no. A-642907, and covering official travel, authorized by and in the interest of the Government, from New York to Athens, Greece, during the period July 14 to July 29, 1933.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL UNION INSURANCE CO., DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11522) to amend the charter of the National Union Insurance Co. of Washington, in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the charter of the National Union Insurance Co. of Washington, granted by an act of Congress approved February 14, 1865, and amended by an act of Congress approved May 11, 1892, is hereby further amended to permit the said insurance company to insure and reinsure risks in all the various forms authorized by section 3 of an act of Congress approved March 14, 1922, entitled "An act to regulate marine insurance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "14" and insert "4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADELE FOWLKES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10876) for the relief of Adele Fowlkes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Adele Fowlkes, the sum of \$5,000, being the amount of her claim for personal injuries incurred July 1, 1933, when a bridge gave way over Chasm Falls at Estes Park, Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the words "being the amount of her claim" and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

At the end of the bill insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATHERINE HARKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8418) for the relief of the estate of Catherine Harkins, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Catherine Harkins, deceased, the sum of \$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government for the fatal injury to Catherine Harkins as the result of her being struck and knocked down by the United States mail truck (Ford) no. 1844, operated by James H. Leonard, a substitute carrier, the accident occurring at 7:20 p. m., October 16, 1930, at the corner of Dorchester Avenue and St. Marks Road, Dorchester, Mass., the said Catherine Harkins, as a result of the injuries received, having died at 9:30 p. m., at the Boston City Hospital, Boston, Mass., on October 16, 1930.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERTHA M. HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8274) for the relief of Bertha M. Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bertha M. Harris, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States, the sum of \$685.96, being reimbursement for clerk hire, rental of fixtures, and salary of Bertha M. Harris, who acted as postmistress at Windfall, Ind., from September 14 to December 30, 1932, both dates inclusive.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$685.96, being reimbursement for clerk hire, rental of fixtures, and salary of" and insert in lieu thereof "\$431.98, representing salary earned by", and at the end of the bill strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendments were agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM L. JENKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11869) for the relief of William L. Jenkins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$481.50 to William L. Jenkins, formerly American Consul at Trebizond, Turkey, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for his failure to receive a like amount appropriated for his relief in Public Law No. 519, approved July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 886), such sum representing the value of personal property lost by him during 1919 as a result of civil disturbances at Trebizond, and which sum was used by the General Accounting Office as a set-off against his then-existing indebtedness to the United States in the amount of \$2,000, but subsequently credited to his accounts by authority of Private Law No. 30, approved May 8, 1935: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11860) to provide an additional sum for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$2,573, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe pursuant to the provisions of Private Law No. 373, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved January 21, 1936, certain officers and enlisted men or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, for losses of and damages to reasonable and necessary personal property resulting from the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall

be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CLARK F. POTTS AND CHARLES H. BARKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11863) for the relief of Clark F. Potts and Charles H. Barker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clark F. Potts, chief boat-swain's mate (L), United States Coast Guard, the sum of \$150.26, and to Charles H. Barker, surman, United States Coast Guard, the sum of \$125.73, in all \$275.99, in full settlement of their claims against the United States for loss or destruction of, or damage to, personal property and effects as a result of the fire which occurred at the Big Sandy Coast Guard Station, Woodville, N. Y., on November 3, 1935: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BOOTH & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10504) for the relief of Booth & Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and in full settlement against the Government, to Booth & Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation, the sum of \$42,856.10, on account of the requisitioning from the said corporation by the United States of section D of pier 4, Bush Terminal, in New York Harbor, and of the possession and control thereof from May 19, 1918, to and including April 30, 1919.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

P. L. ANDREWS CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 12311) for the relief of the P. L. Andrews Corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear and adjudicate, without regard to existing statutes of limitations, the claim of the P. L. Andrews Corporation for just compensation, arising out of the service upon said company of United States Navy Commandeer Order No. N-3255, dated June 18, 1918, with the same right as in other cases to either party to apply to the Supreme Court of the United States for writ of certiorari to review any judgment that may be rendered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

FEDERAL ENAMELING & STAMPING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 12144) for the relief of the Federal Enameling & Stamping Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas Federal Enameling & Stamping Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, was the owner of a plant and property located in McKees Rocks, Pa., the temporary use and occupancy whereof was taken for the public use by the United States on September 13, 1918, under Army requisition no. 738 B/C, ordinance no. 609; and

Whereas the War Department Board of Appraisers, by its award no. 634, under date of February 18, 1919, awarded to the said Federal Enameling & Stamping Co., in just compensation for the use

and occupancy of said plant and property and the damages arising out of the taking thereof as aforesaid, the sum of \$12,847.19; and

Whereas said Federal Enameling & Stamping Co., under date of September 13, 1919, certified that said award was not satisfactory and did not accept the same in full payment of the claim arising out of the taking of said property by virtue of said requisition, and demanded payment of 75 percent thereof as provided in section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the national security and defense, etc.", known as the Food and Fuel Act, approved August 10, 1917, and reserved the right to prosecute any further claim it might have against the United States arising out of the taking of its said property; and

Whereas in compliance with said demand the Government of the United States paid to said Federal Enameling & Stamping Co. on April 2, 1919, the sum of \$9,635.39 and retained the balance of said award, to wit, the sum of \$3,211.80; and

Whereas said Federal Enameling & Stamping Co. did not prosecute any further claim against the United States, and the United States has not paid the aforesaid balance of \$3,211.80: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$6,827.38 to the Federal Enameling & Stamping Co., the balance due under award no. 634 by the War Department Board of Appraisers, together with lawful interest thereon, which award was made in order to compensate said Federal Enameling & Stamping Co. for the use of its property by the United States and damages arising therefrom.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, in the third whereas, strike out the figure "10" and insert "12."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "\$6,827.38" and insert "\$3,211.80."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "together with lawful interest thereon."

The committee amendments were agreed to and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CHARLES D. BIRKHEAD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4115, for the relief of Charles D. Birkhead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RISK and Mr. HANCOCK of New York objected and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

BENJAMIN H. SOUTHERN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 823, for the relief of Benjamin H. Southern.

Mr. GAVAGAN and Mr. McKEOUGH objected and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WILLARD R. COOK & CO. ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4444, directing the Court of Claims to reopen certain cases and to correct the errors therein, if any, by additional judgments against the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there a further objection?

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to reopen the following just-compensation cases on its docket, heretofore disposed of by said court, to wit: Willard R. Cook & Co., Inc., against United States (no. 33984); A. E. Krise, receiver of the Fidelity Land & Investment Corporation (formerly Fidelity Land & Investment Corporation) against United States (no. 33988); Pine Beach Hotel Corporation (now represented by Charles H. Consolvo and A. E. Campe, its receivers) and others against United States (no. 34049); Harry L. Lowenberg and others against United States (no. 34727); Norfolk-Hampton Roads Co. against United States (no. 34751) (all of Norfolk, Va.); William G. Maupin, Jr., and others (now represented by George W. Maupin, as administrator and in his own right, E. Griffith Maupin, S. Dawson Maupin, Allene Maupin, and Ruth Maupin, all of Portsmouth, Va.) docket no. 34681; and to ascertain and determine from the special findings of fact as therein made and recorded by said court, and with due regard to the requirements of the act applicable thereto under which such properties were taken and the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as defined by the Supreme Court in the case of *Seaboard Air Line Railway v. United States* (261 U. S. 299), and other like cases, the amount of just compensation by way of interest, if any, at the rate of 6 percent per annum, alleged to be due and owing by the United States to the parties plaintiff from the date of taking to the time of the payment to them of the original judgments in each of said

cases for their lands situate at Hampton Roads, Va., and taken for public use by the United States on June 28, 1917, by authority of the act of Congress of June 15, 1917 (ch. 29, 40 Stat. 207-208), and taken for public use by the United States on September 20, 1918, by authority of acts of Congress of May 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 550-551), and June 4, 1918 (40 Stat. 595), and an Executive order of the President dated June 18, 1918.

Sec. 2. If said court in such determination from the record in said cases shall find that it failed to include in its judgment in said cases the item of interest at a proper rate, or the equivalent thereof, as an element or part of just compensation then due said parties plaintiff for their said property, then it shall correct the same and adjudge to said parties plaintiff and against the United States in each of the above-specified cases such additional sum of money as may be determined by the court under section 1 of this act, with interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date of payment of the several judgments therein, until March 5, 1925, and the amounts so ascertained shall bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from March 5, 1925, until finally paid by the United States, irrespective of any delay upon the part of the executive departments to see that just compensation is accorded to said landowners in respect of the premises, or any existing statute of limitation, or any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, except that either party litigant shall have the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for a writ of certiorari, as in other cases in the Court of Claims.

Sec. 3. The said court shall promptly proceed in said causes, each and all, upon motions filed therein by the parties plaintiff with the clerk of said court, if so filed within 4 months after the date of the approval of this act.

Sec. 4. Before any money shall be paid to any of the parties plaintiff designated herein in satisfaction of a judgment obtained against the United States under the provision of this act, the Attorney General of the United States shall certify that all actions at law or suits in equity instituted by any such party plaintiff against the United States, or any officer of the United States, have been dismissed and a quitclaim deed has been delivered, conveying and releasing to the United States all the right, title, and interest of such party plaintiff in the said property taken for public use by the United States on June 28, 1917, and September 20, 1918, respectively.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 3, line 16, after the figures "1925", strike out all down to and including the words "United States" in line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD KNOPP

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 864, for the relief of Bernard Knopp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard Knopp, New York City, the sum of \$1,708.27 as settlement in full on account of extra work performed by such Bernard Knopp in making alterations of the Grand Central Palace Building, New York City, for the use of the United States Veterans' Bureau.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "Bureau", insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSCAR L. M'CALLEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 890, for the relief of Oscar L. McCallen.

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. CLARK of Idaho objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MR. AND MRS. CHARLES F. CARTER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2120, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Carter, parents and guardians of Louise Marie Carter, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,151.42 to Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Carter, parents and natural guardians of Louise Marie Carter, a minor, in full settlement of all claims of said guardians and minor against the Government of the United States for injuries received by her on the 4th day of November 1927, when she was severely and permanently injured as a result of the carelessness and negligence of an agent of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", insert "and out of any money in the Treasury for the support of the District of Columbia, one-half each."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "\$10,151.42" and insert "\$2,500."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "minor", insert "all of San Diego, Calif."

Page 2, strike out all of lines 5 and 6 and insert "a negligent failure both on the part of a teacher of the public schools of the District of Columbia and on the part of agents of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, a Government corporation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOYD GATTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5618, for the relief of Floyd Gatton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Floyd Gatton, the sum of \$900, under an agreement by which the Government exercised an option to rent certain property to be used as a landing field, although the project was abandoned by the Government, and this sum as accrued rental recommended by the Department of Commerce for payment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of", strike out the remainder of line 6 and all of lines 7, 8, 9, and 10, and insert: "\$500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by him as a result of his agreeing to lease to the Government certain property to be used as a landing field, which lease was not accepted by the Government due to the Government's decision to locate the landing field at a different site: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE B. NEALE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5759, for the relief of Marie B. Neale.

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. CLARK of Idaho objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DANIEL J. HAGERTY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5829, for the relief of Daniel J. Hagerty.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States, to Daniel J. Hagerty, the sum of \$2,500, said sum being the amount of bond placed for the appearance of a defendant in the United

States District Court, District of New Hampshire, for prosecution under the National Prohibition Act, which defendant was duly tried and convicted, but the sum mentioned was erroneously ordered deposited in the Treasury of the United States, by decree of the court, to apply on unpaid fines and costs in the said criminal case: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "but", insert "after"; page 2, line 2, after the word "was", strike out the word "erroneously."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NANNIE D. HARDING

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7209, for the relief of Nannie D. Harding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. YOUNG objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MARY W. CARSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7361, for the relief of Mary W. Carson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$405 to Mary W. Carson, Spartanburg, S. C., mother of Flying Cadet James W. Carson, who was killed in an airplane crash at Kelly Field, Tex., on March 13, 1934, this sum being equal to 6 months' pay of Cadet Carson.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of the bill after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Chief of Finance of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of the current appropriation 'Pay of the Army', the sum of \$405, to Mary W. Carson of Spartanburg, S. C., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States as mother of Flying Cadet James W. Carson, who was killed in an airplane crash at Kelly Field, Tex., on March 13, 1934, said sum being equal to 6 months' pay: *Provided*, That said Mary W. Carson shall first show to the satisfaction of the Secretary of War that she was actually dependent upon her son, James W. Carson, at the time of his death, and the determination of such dependency by the Secretary of War shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM E. JONES ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7496, for the relief of William E. Jones, Walter M. Marston, William Ellery, Richard P. Hallowell, Second, and Malcolm Donald as executors under the will of Frank W. Hallowell; and Malcolm Donald as executor under the will of Gordon Donald.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to receive, consider, and determine, in accordance with law, but without regard to any statute of limitations, any claims filed not later than 6 months after the passage of this act by William E. Jones, of Newton, Mass.; Walter M. Marston, of Newton, Mass.; William Ellery, of Brookline, Mass.; Richard P. Hallowell, 2d, and Malcolm Donald as executors under the will of Frank W. Hallowell, late of Newton, Mass.; and

Malcolm Donald as executor under the will of Gordon Donald, late of Wellesley, Mass., for the refund of Federal income and excess-profits taxes collected from the said William E. Jones, Walter M. Marston, William Ellery, Frank W. Hallowell, and Gordon Donald for the year 1917 in excess of the amounts properly due; and any claim so filed shall be regarded and treated for all purposes as if it had been duly filed within the period fixed by any statute of limitations which, except for the passage of this act, would be applicable thereto: *Provided*, That in the settlement of any claim so filed there shall be no allowance of interest.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to the said William E. Jones, Walter M. Marston, William Ellery, Frank W. Hallowell, and Gordon Donald any amount allowed in the determination of any claim filed in accordance with this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 2 of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATHERINE T. McNALLY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8257, for the relief of Catherine T. McNally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOPE, Mr. HANCOCK of New York, and Mr. MOTT objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JAMES B. KILEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9191, for the relief of dependents of James B. Kiley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in the first paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, be, and they are hereby, waived in favor of dependents of the late James B. Kiley, whose death resulted from an injury sustained while employed as a clerk at the post office, Cooperstown, N. Y., and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to act, in accordance with the remaining provisions of that act, upon any claim filed in their behalf within 6 months after the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER T. KARSHNER ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9390, for the relief of Walter T. Karshner, Katherine Karshner, Anne M. Karshner, and Mrs. James E. McShane.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Walter T. Karshner, Columbus, Ohio, the sum of \$1,000; (2) Katherine Karshner, Columbus, Ohio, the sum of \$150; (3) Anne M. Karshner, Columbus, Ohio, the sum of \$596.26; and (4) Mrs. James E. McShane, Columbus, Ohio, the sum of \$1,500. The payment of such sums to such persons shall be in full settlement of their respective claims against the United States for damages sustained by such persons when the car in which they were riding was hit by a Government truck in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of the bill after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, upon the claims of Walter T. Karshner, Katherine Karshner, Anne M. Karshner, and Mrs. James E. McShane, all of Columbus, Ohio, for damages resulting from personal injuries and property damage received by them on January 29, 1935, at Columbus, Ohio, by reason of an automobile collision involving a Civilian Conservation Corps truck: *Provided*, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed, in the case of Walter T. Karshner, \$1,000; in the case of Katherine Karshner, \$150; in the case of Anne M. Karshner, \$596.26; and in the case of Mrs. James E. McShane, \$1,500.

"Sec. 2. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgments thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Walter T. Karshner, Katherine Karshner, Anne M. Karshner, and Mrs. James E. McShane."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. J. NOLAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9502, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. J. Nolan, L. Jacobson, J. A. Higuera, C. H. Damsted, R. Galleguillo, F. G. Grigsby, K. H. Johnson, R. Dupouy, C. J. Degen, W. L. Nolan, R. C. Jensen, M. J. Roderick, L. K. Moore, C. Lederer, M. Kelley, R. Dinkel, A. J. Mouchou, C. R. Taylor, M. Knoll, S. W. Ligon, C. C. Johnson, W. P. Brennan, C. F. Siebert, and J. T. Weeks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. J. Nolan, L. Jacobson, J. A. Higuera, C. H. Damsted, R. Galleguillo, F. G. Grigsby, K. H. Johnson, R. Dupouy, C. J. Degen, W. L. Nolan, R. C. Jensen, M. J. Roderick, L. K. Moore, C. Lederer, M. Kelley, R. Dinkel, A. J. Mouchou, C. R. Taylor, M. Knoll, S. W. Ligon, C. C. Johnson, W. P. Brennan, C. F. Siebert, and J. T. Weeks, all of Vallejo, Calif., for extra labor over and above the regular day of 8 hours performed at Mare Island Navy Yard, Calif., in accordance with the order of the Secretary of the Navy, dated December 1, 1920: *Provided*, That the action in the Court of Claims to establish such losses and damages may be instituted within 1 year from the date of the approval of this act, and the same right of appeal to the United States Supreme Court from the judgment of the Court of Claims shall be had as in other causes in that court.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 6, strike out the words "regular day of 8 hours" and insert in lieu thereof the words "16-hour period of duty per day required to be."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "California", insert the words "which extra labor over said period was not."

Page 2, lines 11, 12, 13, and 14, strike out the words "and the same right of appeal to the United States Supreme Court from the judgment of the Court of Claims shall be had as in other causes in that court" and insert in lieu thereof the words "without regard to any statute of limitations."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD A. FOOTE, JR., AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 11123, for the relief of Edward A. Foote, Jr., and others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward A. Foote, Jr., the sum of \$153.25; Durham E. Allen, \$150.80; Daniel L. Boland, \$215.65; Eugene A. Bond, \$37.45; Emanuel Bublick, \$152.20; W. Earle Butler, \$150; James J. Caffrey, \$101.36; Bernard B. Carraher, \$136.85; E. Hubert Cashion, \$124.77; John Darsey, \$260.10; A. W. DeBirney, \$178.75; Charles D. Dimmock, \$330.65; George Foulkes, \$129.45; C. A. Giblein, \$27.50; W. H. Griffin, \$297.30; Frank Hursey, \$157.80; James W. Irwin, \$407.28; Fred M. Ivey, \$151.65; Arthur F. McCarthy, \$130.10; Edward A. Mag, \$138.65; Reuben J. Martin, \$195.15; L. W. C. Mather, \$177.15; Daniel J. Murphy, \$137.75;

William L. Pencke, \$118.75; Edgar W. Pharr, \$129.45; Earle Boyd Pierce, \$146.25; James F. Pinkney, \$150; James I. Rooney, \$131.80; J. Carlisle Stuckey, \$67.75; Morris Weinfeld, \$340.34; Patrick A. Conway, \$162.50; Samuel E. Ewing, Jr., \$167.05; Richard W. Fuchs, \$302.90; Robert S. Keebler, \$157.50; Dallas C. Kirby, \$165; Robert W. Strange, \$114.38; Fred A. Weller, \$180.09; Thomas R. Vaughan, \$81.70; and John Grigsby, \$197.10. Such sums represent amounts to which such persons would be entitled for traveling and subsistence expenses during the period from December 1934 to June 1935, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, in connection with their transfers and assignments to field offices, and the discharge of their duties while stationed at such offices, as employees of the National Recovery Administration. Vouchers submitted to cover such expenses were refused certification on preaudit by the Comptroller General on the ground that such employees were not properly placed in a travel status in connection with such transfers, assignments, or discharge of duties, although it was intended and considered by the administrative officers of the National Recovery Administration that such employees should be and were properly placed in a travel status in such connection.

Sec. 2. In case there has been heretofore withheld or deducted from any amounts otherwise payable out of Government funds to any person hereinabove named any amount on account of any item paid or allowed for transportation charges in connection with the transfer and assignment hereinabove referred to, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to such person a sum equal to the amount so withheld or deducted.

Sec. 3. Each person named in section 1 of this act is hereby released from any liability to refund or pay to the Government, or otherwise discharge, any item paid or allowed for transportation charges in connection with the transfer and assignment referred to in such section, and no deductions on account of any such item shall be made from any amount due or payable out of Government funds to any such person.

With the following committee amendments:

After the enacting clause, strike out all of section 1 of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to receive and settle the claims of Edward A. Foote, Jr.; Durham E. Allen; Daniel L. Boland; Eugene A. Bond; Emanuel Bublick; W. Earle Butler; James J. Caffrey; Bernard B. Carraher; E. Hubert Cashion; John Darsey; A. W. DeBirney; Charles D. Dimmock; George Foulkes; C. A. Giblein; W. H. Griffin; Frank Hursey; James W. Irwin; Fred M. Ivey; Arthur F. McCarthy; Edward A. Mag; Reuben J. Martin; L. W. C. Mather; Daniel J. Murphy; William L. Pencke; Edgar W. Pharr; Earle Boyd Pierce; James F. Pinkney; James I. Rooney; J. Carlisle Stuckey; Morris Weinfeld; Patrick A. Conway; Samuel E. Ewing, Jr.; Richard W. Fuchs; Robert S. Keebler; Dallas C. Kirby; Robert W. Strange; Fred A. Weller; Thomas R. Vaughan; John Grigsby; and Curley C. Hoffpauir for transportation, travel, and subsistence expenses during the period from December 1934 to June 1935, upon their transfer and assignment to temporary or permanent stations and to allow, if otherwise correct, per diem not exceeding 30 days after arrival at station, notwithstanding the travel orders were not issued by proper authority and the change of stations was permanent and not temporary. All such claims allowed shall be payable under the appropriation otherwise available for such expenditures for the fiscal year in which the obligation was incurred: *Provided*, That there shall be a sufficient sum available under such appropriation to settle such claims which may be found allowable; otherwise, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sufficient sum of money to meet the difference."

On page 3, in line 10, strike out the words "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert in lieu thereof "Comptroller General of the United States."

On page 3, in lines 11 and 12, strike out the wording "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" and insert in lieu thereof "in accordance with the same provisions as outlined in section 1."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVERETT P. SHERIDAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 11668, to credit the account of Everett P. Sheridan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of Everett P. Sheridan, former postmaster at Warren, Mass., in the amount of \$37.74, entered on the accounts of the said Everett P. Sheridan, former postmaster at Warren, Mass., by reason of his deposit of postal funds of the United States in the First National Bank of Warren, Mass., and the subsequent failure of such bank.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out the wording of the bill after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"That in the final settlement of the accounts of Everett P. Sheridan, deceased, former postmaster at Warren, Mass., credit is hereby authorized in the sum of \$37.74, being the difference between the amount of war-savings funds on deposit to his official credit in the First National Bank of Warren, Mass., when said bank closed in 1923 and the aggregate amount thereafter received by the Government as dividends in the liquidation of the bank's affairs."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRIER-LOWRANCE CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 12522, for the relief of Grier-Lowrance Construction Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of Grier-Lowrance Construction Co., Inc., for losses and damages suffered under contract no. AMB 28, dated May 18, 1929, for the construction of the foundation for the several structures of the Arlington Memorial Bridge project be, and the same is hereby, referred to the United States Court of Claims with jurisdiction to hear the same to judgment, said claim to be adjudicated upon the basis of all losses or damages suffered by the said company due to acts of the Government or to delays caused by the Government or subsurface conditions unknown to the contractor and not disclosed by the Government before contract was entered into, notwithstanding failure on the part of the claimant company to file written protests, or any lapse of time or any provisions of the statute of limitations: *Provided*, That suit hereunder is instituted within 4 months from the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH KURAU

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1435, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Elizabeth Kurau.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, upon the claim of Elizabeth Kurau, of Torrington, Conn., for damages resulting from injuries received by her on April 2, 1934, near Torrington, Conn., by reason of an automobile collision in which a Civilian Conservation Corps automobile truck was involved: *Provided*, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed the sum of \$5,000.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN WALKER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3371, for the relief of John Walker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Walker, of Hays, Mont., or his heirs, the sum of \$200 in full settlement of his claim against the United States for destruction of a 1-room log house and equipment located on the Fort Belknap Reservation in Montana, during a diphtheria epidemic on said reservation.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after "reservation", insert "in the winter of 1933: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful,

any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. T. HIRD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3441, for the relief of C. T. Hird.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. T. Hird, of Dubuque, Iowa, the sum of \$839.22, in full satisfaction of the claim of said C. T. Hird against the United States for a refund of income taxes erroneously assessed against him and paid by him under protest, which claim was disallowed on the ground of failure to file within the statutory period of limitation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "him" insert "for the year 1920"; line 11, after the word "limitation" insert "although his claim had previously been timely made and rejected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue pending decision of the legality of the tax by several circuit courts of appeals which found it illegal."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

T. H. WAGNER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3607, for the relief of T. H. Wagner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to T. H. Wagner, the sum of \$273, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages on account of personal injuries suffered by him when he was struck on the head by a rock thrown by a dynamite blast set off by members of the Civilian Conservation Corps at Lake Mary, near Flagstaff, Ariz., on August 26, 1935: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VINSON & PRINGLE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3608, for the relief of Vinson & Pringle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Vinson and Pringle, the sum of \$301 in full satisfaction of their claim against the Buff mountain-type transit, belonging to them, which was lost United States for damages arising out of the loss of a Bluff and while in the custody of the Civil Works Administration, in Arizona, under a rental agreement: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAUD KELLEY THOMAS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3824, for the relief of Maud Kelley Thomas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the current appropriation, "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy", to Maud Kelley Thomas, sister of Orloff Allen Kelley, late chief machinist's mate, United States Navy, an amount equal to 6 months' pay at the rate said Orloff Allen Kelley was receiving at the date of his death: *Provided*, That the said Maud Kelley Thomas establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy that she was actually dependent upon her brother, Orloff Allen Kelley, at the time of the latter's death, and the determination of such fact by the Secretary of the Navy shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. D. GANN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4052, for the relief of W. D. Gann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. D. Gann the sum of \$2,180 in full settlement against the Government for property loss sustained by him as a result of his airplane being damaged by a Navy Department motorcycle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "motorcycle", insert "on April 14, 1935, at Floyd Bennett Field, Brooklyn, N. Y."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMER BRETT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4140, for the relief of Homer Brett, Esq., American consul at Rotterdam, Netherlands, as a result of money stolen from the safe of the American consulate.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Homer Brett, Esq., American consul at Rotterdam, Netherlands, the sum of \$116.58, such sum representing the unrecovered amount stolen from the safe of the American consulate at Rotterdam, Netherlands, on the night of September 27, 1935.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Homer Brett, American consul at Rotterdam, Netherlands, the sum of \$116.58 in full settlement of his claim against the United States for the unrecovered amount of Government funds stolen from the safe of the American consulate at Rotterdam, Netherlands, on the night of September 27, 1935: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read as follows: "An act for the relief of Homer Brett, American consul at Rotterdam, Netherlands."

WILLIAM H. BROCKMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4233, for the relief of William H. Brockman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the charges entered on the pay accounts of William H. Brockman, lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, in the amount of \$317.34, and to pay to said William H. Brockman, out of money appropriated for the pay of Navy personnel, any amount heretofore deducted from his pay on account of such charges; such charges having been entered on the accounts of said William H. Brockman by reason of extra pay received by him for the performance of duty at submarine escape training tanks, and a subsequent ruling that he was not entitled to such extra pay because such duty was not actually performed on board a submarine.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIANA LIMESTONE CORPORATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4379, for the relief of the Indiana Limestone Corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Indiana Limestone Corporation the sum of \$5,976.93. Such sum represents additional costs incurred by such corporation as a subcontractor for the James Stewart Co., general contractors, for work performed in connection with carving of metopes in the Interstate Commerce Commission, Labor, and connecting-wing building in performance of a contract with the Department of the Treasury dated June 18, 1932 (contract no. T-1-SA-3271): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "represents" and insert "shall be in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. MORAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 12730, to authorize the payment of an annuity to William H. Moran, Chief of the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department, upon his retirement, in recognition and appreciation of his services to the United States.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. YOUNG objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Civil Service.

MICHAEL E. SULLIVAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 11867, for the relief of Michael E. Sullivan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Michael E. Sullivan, postmaster at Park Ridge, Ill., with the sum of \$14,679.29, representing the amount of public funds and property lost in the burglary of the post office at Park Ridge, Ill., on March 6, 1935, such loss having resulted from no fault or negligence on the part of said postmaster, as determined by the Postmaster General under a provision in volume 39, United States Code, section 49.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "volume" and insert "title."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD R. WOOD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 10509, authorizing the President to present in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to Harold R. Wood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to Harold R. Wood, formerly a corporal of the United States Marine Corps, for conspicuous bravery on the night of October 31–November 1, 1919, as an officer in the Gendarmerie d'Haiti.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "present", strike out "in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor" and insert "Distinguished Service Medals to Col. James J. Meade, United States Marine Corps, and".
Page 2, line 1, strike out "an officer" and insert "officers."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill authorizing the President to present Distinguished Service Medals to James J. Meade and Harold R. Wood."

MOJO SCHEY CO., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6743, for the relief of Mojo Schey Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mojo Schey Co., Inc., the sum of \$306 for reimbursement of that amount paid to the collector of customs at the port of New York as balance of customs duty on certain cotton hosiery imported in November 1926; said amount was collected and paid as the result of an error made in the office of the collector of customs, which error was not discovered within the period for formal protest as provided by law (sec. 514, Tariff Act of 1922).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "for reimbursement of that" and insert "in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for an."

On page 2, after line 3, insert: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DAVID C. STAFFORD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7743, for the relief of Mrs. David C. Stafford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. David C. Stafford, Kingsland, Ga., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said Mrs. David C. Stafford on account of the death of her husband, David C. Stafford, who was fatally injured on December 14, 1934, at Kingsland, Ga., in a collision involving a car in which he was a passenger and a Government vehicle in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,500."

Page 2, after line 3, insert: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLEN HOLMES

The clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9006, for settlement of claim of Allen Holmes.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Allen Holmes, of Birmingham, Ala., the sum of \$493.70 in full settlement of a claim against the Government for illegal detention in, and services at, Camp McClellan, Ala., for the period from September 6, 1918, to March 15, 1919.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$493.70" and insert "\$262."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "March" and insert "January."

Page 1, line 10, after "1919" insert: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILO MILLISER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9008, for the relief of Milo Milliser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Milo Milliser, of Barron, Wis., the sum of \$5,000 as compensation for permanent personal injuries received at the hands of a Federal officer of the Lac du Flambeau Reservation on October 9, 1933.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000 as compensation" and insert "\$1,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

In line 10, after the figures "1933", insert: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVANELL DURRANCE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9111, for the relief of Evanel Durrance.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Evanel Durrance the sum of \$15,000 in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for the death of her parents, Samuel E. Townsend and Elizabeth Townsend, who were killed in a collision between an automobile in which they were passengers and a truck owned by the Department of Agriculture, the same having occurred a short distance east of Greenville, Madison County, Fla., November 9, 1930: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment as if the United States were suable in

tort, upon the claim of Evanel Durrance, of Jacksonville, Fla., for damages resulting from the death of her parents, Samuel E. Townsend and Elizabeth Townsend, who were killed in a collision between an automobile in which they were passengers and a truck owned by the Department of Agriculture, the same having occurred a short distance east of Greenville, Madison County, Fla., on November 9, 1930."

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 2, line 25, after the figures "1930", insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the judgment rendered against the United States, if any, shall not exceed the sum of \$5,000."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. D. HAMPTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 10258, for the relief of A. D. Hampton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to A. D. Hampton, father of Adam D. Hampton, Jr., a minor, who died from injuries sustained by the said Adam D. Hampton, Jr., when the car in which he was a passenger was sideswiped by a Government vehicle operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, while said vehicle was on official business, on October 7, 1934, on United States Highway No. 64, near London, Ark.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, upon the claim of Adam D. Hampton, of Russellville, Ark., for damages resulting to him by reason of the death of his minor son, Adam D. Hampton, Jr., who was killed when the vehicle in which he was a passenger was sideswiped by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on United States Highway No. 64, near London, Ark., October 7, 1934.

"Sec. 2. In the determination of such claim, on questions relating to contributory negligence of a minor, contributory negligence of a parent for the injury or death of a minor, and the proper measure of damage, if any, accruing to a parent as the result of the wrongful death of his minor child, the said district court is hereby empowered to consider and determine such questions in accordance with the laws of the State of Arkansas, as well as the decisions of its courts: *Provided*, That the judgment rendered against the United States, if any, shall not exceed the sum of \$5,000.

"Sec. 3. Suit upon such claim shall be instituted within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, except as otherwise provided in section 2 of this act, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adam D. Hampton."

GEORGE E. WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10277) for the relief of George E. Wilson.

At the request of Mr. COSTELLO, an identical Senate bill, S. 3652, was substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George E. Wilson the sum of \$300, representing the amount paid by him on December 12, 1928, to the United States District Court for the Southern

District of Mississippi as surety on the forfeited appearance bond of one Ed Ward, who willfully defaulted on a charge of violation of the liquor law but who was subsequently rearrested and convicted through the efforts of the said George E. Wilson: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL HARDIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10916) for the relief of Carl Hardin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of \$1,000 to Carl Hardin for damages as the result of personal injuries suffered when the vehicle in which he was riding on a public highway in Missouri was struck and damaged by a Government Forest Service truck on the 11th day of August 1934, near Steelville, Mo.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl Hardin, of Steelville, Mo., the sum of \$500; and to W. E. Payne, of Steelville, Mo., the sum of \$350; in all, \$850, in full settlement of their respective claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when the vehicle in which they were riding was struck by a truck of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, on Missouri State Highway No. 8, near Steelville, August 11, 1934."

At the end of the bill insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELBERT ARNOLD JARRELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10995) for the relief of Elbert Arnold Jarrell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elbert Arnold Jarrell the sum of \$8,211 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages suffered by reason of being struck and seriously injured by a Government truck which was driven by an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the result of which has resulted in his being unable to provide for himself, his wife, and his six children.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents,

attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BROOKS-CALLAWAY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11262) for the relief of Brooks-Callaway Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate the claim of Brooks-Callaway Co., of Atlanta, Ga., for losses growing out of a contract with the War Department (no. W-1092 Eng. 3061) on account of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and make recommendations to the Congress for a fair and equitable settlement of it.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "make recommendations to the Congress for a fair and equitable settlement of it" and insert in lieu thereof "report to the Congress for consideration as an equitable claim, such losses as may be found to have been caused directly or indirectly by the operation of said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEVELAND L. SHORT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11861) for the relief of Cleveland L. Short.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cleveland L. Short, the sum of \$1,572.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for permanent injuries sustained by him on June 14, 1909, while employed by the Isthmian Canal Commission: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY DALEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 12166) for the relief of Mary Daley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Daley, the sum of \$550 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States, for damages sustained by her as a result of a collision of a Government-owned and operated motor vehicle with her automobile on or about August 19, 1935: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Daley", insert "of Syracuse, N. Y."
Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$550" and insert "\$225."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "damages" and insert "personal injuries."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Government-owned and operated" and insert "Civilian Conservation Corps."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "or about" and insert "Highbridge Road near Lyndon, N. Y."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 8455) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and for other purposes, which I send to the desk for printing under the rule.

MATTHEW A. HENSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 12388) to provide for the recognition of the heroic conduct and devotion to duty of Matthew A. Hensen, one of the survivors of the polar expedition of Admiral Peary, and to provide a life pension for the said Matthew A. Hensen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Whereas Matthew A. Hensen acted as aide to the late Admiral Robert E. Peary in quest of the North Pole, and in company with Admiral Peary discovered the North Pole on foot; and

Whereas Matthew A. Hensen accompanied Admiral Peary in all his polar expeditions, facing unknown perils with unflinching devotion to duty, and at the risk of his own life saved that of Admiral Peary, thereby making the discovery of the North Pole possible in 1909; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper that recognition be accorded to Matthew A. Hensen for the loyalty, bravery, and valor displayed by him in aiding Admiral Peary to discover the North Pole: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Director of the United States Mint be, and he is hereby, authorized to prepare a suitable die and to strike a suitable gold medal to commemorate the heroic service rendered by Matthew A. Hensen on the polar expedition of Admiral Peary, and that said medal be presented by the President of the United States to Matthew A. Hensen.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to provide, from moneys not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500 to cover the cost of designing and producing said medal in the manner provided in this act.

Sec. 3. That, in further recognition of the service rendered to Admiral Peary which terminated in the discovery of the North Pole, Matthew A. Hensen shall be paid an annual pension of \$2,500, said pension to be paid monthly by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and commence immediately upon Matthew A. Hensen's resignation from the United States Customs Service.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out the whereases.

Page 2, strike out all of section 2 and insert:

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Strike out all of section 3.

The committee amendments were agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read:

A bill to provide for the recognition of the heroic conduct and devotion to duty of Matthew A. Hensen, one of the survivors of the polar expedition of Admiral Peary.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMELIA EARHART PUTNAM

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 123, to provide for the coinage of a medal in commemoration of the achievements of Amelia Earhart Putnam.

Mr. YOUNG and Mr. TABER objected, and the joint resolution was recommitted to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

GEORGE M. COHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4641) authorizing the President to present a gold medal to George M. Cohan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Only one objection is heard. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to present, but not in the name of Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design to George M. Cohan, in recognition of his services during the World War in composing the patriotic song Over There, and prior thereto that thrilling song A Grand Old Flag.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10440) for the relief of certain officers of the Foreign Service of the United States, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war or other causes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money:

To Ernest L. Harris, formerly American consul general at Irkutsk, Siberia, the sum of \$1,899, such sum, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, representing the value of reasonable and necessary personal property lost as a result of warlike conditions in Russia in 1918 and 1919.

To T. Brooks Alford, formerly vice consul at Moscow and other posts in Russia, the sum of \$276.01, such sum representing the value of reasonable and necessary personal property lost as a result of warlike conditions in Russia between the years 1916 and 1918.

To Oscar S. Heizer, formerly American consul general and interpreter at Constantinople, Turkey, the sum of \$456, such sum representing the value of reasonable and necessary personal property lost as a result of warlike conditions in Turkey between the years 1915 and 1918.

To Thomas M. Powell, American vice consul at Nogales, Sonora, Mexico, the sum of \$268, such sum representing the value of reasonable and necessary personal property lost as a result of a fire which destroyed the American consulate at Nogales, on October 10, 1935:

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim thereof as allowed shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with any such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated for any claim in this act in excess of 10 percent of such claim as allowed on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000. The aforesaid amounts shall be considered in full settlement of the aforesaid claims.

SEC. 2. That if the Secretary of State shall find that any payment on account of any individual loss herein set forth has been made to or on behalf of any of the claimants herein named by any foreign government, the amount of such payment shall be deducted from the amount herein authorized to be paid to such claimant: *Provided,* That any payment which hereafter may be made on account of any of the aforesaid losses, to or on behalf of any of the aforesaid claimants by any foreign government through the Department of State, in an amount not to exceed the amount actually paid to any of the aforesaid claimants, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

GARFIELD ARTHUR ROSS

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 4079) for relief of Garfield Arthur Ross, and in connection with that ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. What is the calendar number?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Two hundred and thirty-nine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is it on the calendar?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. It is not now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

JOHN E. T. CLARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7244) for the relief of John E. T. Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of John E. T. Clark, postmaster at Coalgate, Okla., in the sum of \$6,236.92, on account of the loss of postal, Treasury, savings, money-order, war-revenue, and other funds resulting from the failure of banks in Coalgate, Okla.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of John E. T. Clark, former postmaster at Coalgate, Okla., in the sum of \$6,113.93 on account of the loss of postal, Treasury-savings, postal-savings, money-order, and war-revenue funds, resulting from the failure of the City National Bank of Coalgate, Okla., on November 5, 1923, and the First National Bank of Coalgate, Okla., on January 8, 1924."

The committee amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

WILLIAM BLAKLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8330, for the relief of William Blakley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to William Blakley any sum of money on deposit to the credit of Joseph Blakley in the ship's bank of the U. S. S. *West Virginia*. The said Joseph Blakley, first electrician's mate, was in service on the said steamship at the time of his death and left no person qualified to take from his estate under the laws of the State of his domicile, but he was an adopted son of the parents of the said William Blakley, with whom the said Joseph Blakley made his home after the death of his foster parents.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of lines 3 to 11, on page 1, and lines 1 and 2, on page 2, and insert the following:

"That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to William Blakley, or Blakley, as administrator of the estate of Joseph Blakley, late chief electrician's mate, United States Navy, the sum of money credited to the account of said decedent in the ship's bank of the U. S. S. *West Virginia*, or elsewhere if it shall have been transferred therefrom, constituting pay and allowances due and unpaid on the date of his, the said Joseph Blakley's, death on May 13, 1926, the naval hospital, San Diego, Calif., and all cash found in his personal effects on or subsequent to said date: *Provided,* That the said William Blakley, or Blakley, shall first file an affidavit with the Comptroller General of the United States showing the correct spelling of his, the claimant's surname: *Provided further,* That the sum so paid under this act shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for pay and allowances and cash from the personal effects of said decedent, Joseph Blakley: *And provided further,* That no part of the payment authorized and directed to be made in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the settlement of this account, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of William Blakley, or Blakley, as administrator of the estate of Joseph Blakley, deceased."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JOHN E. CALLAWAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 10330, for the relief of the estate of John E. Callaway.

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. CLARK of Idaho objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

FLORIDA HURRICANE RELIEF, WORLD WAR VETERANS, ETC.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file minority views on the bill (H. R. 12869) to liberalize the provisions of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, to effect uniform provisions in laws administered by

the Veterans' Administration, to extend the Employees' Compensation Act with limitations to certain World War veterans and other persons and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

MATT BURGESS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 10746, for the relief of Matt Burgess.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,500 to Matt Burgess, which sum was paid by him to the United States District Court at Charleston, W. Va., by reason of the forfeiture of his bail bond on June 1, 1926.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$6,500."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "Burgess", strike out the words "which sum was paid by him to the United States District Court at Charleston, W. Va.", and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States because of a judgment rendered against and paid by him."

Page 1, line 11, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. A. PEVELER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 11597, for the relief of L. A. Peveler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to L. A. Peveler, Granbury, Tex., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said L. A. Peveler on account of the loss of his minor son, Hollis Peveler, who was killed on June 20, 1918, near Granbury, Tex., by a piece from the propeller of a United States Army airplane.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500."

Page 2, at the end of the bill insert: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN W. HUBBARD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3080, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John W. Hubbard.

There being no objection the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John W. Hubbard, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against the United States for damages for injury to the steamboat *Senator Cordill* and its cargo on February 5, 1934, when such steamboat struck a submerged wicket of United States dam no. 14, on the Ohio River and sank.

Sec. 2. Such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitation. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S. C. EASTVOLD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3600, for the relief of S. C. Eastvold.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to S. C. Eastvold, pastor of the First Lutheran Church, of Eau Claire, Wis., the sum of \$100, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the refund of a deposit made by him upon application for the entry and classification of a parish paper as second-class mail matter, such application having been denied: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. W. JERMARK

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3768, for the relief of E. W. Jermark.

There being no objection the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of E. W. Jermark, former superintendent and special disbursing agent for the Lac du Flambeau Indian Agency, Lac du Flambeau, Wis., in the sum of \$268.45, representing payments made by him to G. B. Aschenbrenner, credit for which was disallowed by certificate of settlement no. G-42484-In, dated July 19, 1933.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FOSTER M'LYNN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3850, for the relief of Mrs. Foster McLynn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Foster McLynn, of Portland, Oreg., the sum of \$110, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States arising out of damages to her summer home in Mount Hood National Forest, which was struck by rocks thrown by blasting operations carried on by members of the Civilian Conservation Corps in connection with the Lady Creek water project, in March or April 1933: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACOB KAISER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3956, for the relief of Jacob Kaiser.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to Jacob Kaiser the sum of \$500 in full and final settlement of any and all claims against the Government of the United States for injuries suffered by him as a result of an accident involving a Government vehicle operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, on United States Highway No. 10, at a point approximately 12 miles east of Billings, Mont., on October 8, 1934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent

thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$500" and insert "\$350."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT ANDERSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4116, for the relief of Grant Anderson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Grant Anderson, Crow Creek Reservation, S. Dak., the sum of \$226.67, such sum representing the remainder of a refund due the said Grant Anderson from the estate of Julia White Cloud or Julia Voice, deceased heir of Philip His Day, on account of a certain canceled contract entered into between the said Grant Anderson and the Department of the Interior on December 11, 1920, relating to the purchase of 160 acres of land owned by the heirs of Philip His Day, deceased Crow Creek allottee no. 929. The said Grant Anderson shall execute and deliver to the Secretary of the Interior an assignment, satisfactory to the Secretary, assigning to the United States all his right, title, and interest in and to the remainder of such refund. All sums recovered from the estate of Julia White Cloud or Julia Voice by the United States under such assignment shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "such sum representing" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for."

At the end of the bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD F. HICKEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4119, for the relief of Bernard F. Hickey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard F. Hickey, a major, United States Marine Corps, retired, the sum of \$1,587.25 in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for the loss of certain of his personal property on September 1, 1923, in the earthquake and fire at Kamakura, Japan, while serving as an assistant attaché of the American Embassy at Tokyo, Japan.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERRITT-CHAPMAN & SCOTT CORPORATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4542, authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of the Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corporation for an amount not exceeding \$4,790.53 for services and material furnished at the request of the Secretary of the Navy under contract no. Nod-210, dated May 19, 1934, in connection with salvage of the steamship *Morro Castle*. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$4,790.53 for payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAMPICO MARINE IRON WORKS ET AL.

The Clerk called Senate Joint Resolution 61, to repeal an act approved February 17, 1933, entitled "An act for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works", and to provide for the relief of William Saenger, chairman, liquidating committee of the Beaumont Export & Import Co., of Beaumont, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act approved February 17, 1933, entitled "An act for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works", being Private Act No. 209, Seventy-second Congress, be, and the same is hereby, repealed; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Saenger, chairman, liquidating committee of the Beaumont Export & Import Co. for the Tampico Marine Iron Works, a foreign corporation, the sum of \$1,500 in full settlement of all claims due the Tampico Marine Iron Works by the Government of the United States to work on, repairing, raising, and furnishing material for the United States Shipping Board vessel *Latham*, during the year 1920: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST F. BRASS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 12904, validating a town-lot certificate and authorizing and directing issuance of a patent for the same to Ernest F. Brass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 4713) validating a town-lot certificate and authorizing and directing issuance of a patent for the same to Ernest F. Brass may be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on payment of \$63 in addition to the \$135 already paid the town-lot certificate which was issued to Ernest F. Brass April 23, 1936, for lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, block 100; lots 1 and 2, block 102; and lots 6, 7, and 8, block 87, in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho, be, and the same is hereby, validated, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue a patent thereon.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 12904) were laid on the table.

CIVIL WAR PENSIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 12908, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows, former widows, and helpless and dependent children of soldiers of the Civil War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Jamaica Taylor, widow of Charles D. Taylor, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Tiger, helpless and dependent daughter of Nathan L. Tiger, late of Battery D, First Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Edward Armel, helpless and dependent son of William Armel, late of Company K, One Hundred and Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Fannie J. Mann, widow of William J. Mann, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Bettie L. Patterson, widow of Thomas F. Patterson, late of Company D, Eighty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Wilhelmine Skilling, widow of Edward Skilling, late of Company G, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Fosket, widow of William M. Fosket, late of Company B, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret Teed, widow of Edward Teed, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Effie Wilson, widow of Nathan Wilson, late of Company E, Forty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Clara Dempsey, widow of James Dempsey, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah C. Cary, widow of John Cary, late of Company H, One Hundred and Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah C. Wythe, widow of James Wythe, late of Company A, One Hundred and Twenty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henrietta F. Lowry, widow of Walter Lowry, late of Company K, One Hundred and Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Julian A. Myers, helpless and dependent son of Hiram A. Myers, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Dona Samples, former widow of William Conkin, late of Company E, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month and increase the rate to \$30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary Ann Holland, widow of Adolphus Holland, late of Company I, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy S. Oldham, widow of William P. Oldham, late of Company F, One Hundred and Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rebecca Patterson, widow of Charles T. Patterson, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy A. Russell, widow of Cornelius Russell, late of Company H, One Hundred and Ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Josephine Dolen, widow of Henry Dolen, late of Company A, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca Aubrey, widow of William Aubrey, late of Company K, Eighty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura Alice Hammaker, widow of Adam Hammaker, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Susan Wells, widow of Marcus Wells, late of Company K, Fifty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Estline Baker, widow of William D. Baker, late of Company D, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie A. Alexander, widow of James H. Alexander, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and Eleventh Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Fannie Davis, widow of John E. Davis, late of Company G, Second Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Princess May Stone, widow of Joseph Stone, late of Company C, One Hundred and Thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda Trafford, widow of James H. Trafford, late of Company F, Eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sophia M. Webster, former widow of Eleazer B. Howard, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma C. Andrews, widow of James M. Andrews, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Florence A. Clarkson, widow of Abraham Clarkson, late of Company C, One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan A. Westbrook, widow of Charles Westbrook, late of Company K, First Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie B. Roberts, widow of Daniel M. Roberts, late of Company G, Ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriett M. Hughes, widow of John W. Hughes, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month and increase the rate to \$30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary C. Hoyt, widow of William L. Hoyt, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Glennie Edwinton, widow of Christopher Edwinton, late of Company G, Sixty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month and increase the rate to \$30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Ella May Faris, helpless and dependent daughter of Finley Faris, late of Company H, One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Della Porter, widow of Luke Porter, late of Company D, Ninety-eighth Regiment, and Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment, United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Keturah O. Donnels, widow of George Lindon Donnels, late of Company A, One Hundred and Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara E. Huffman, former widow of Sylvester T. Bryan, late of Company G, One Hundred and Eighteenth Regiment, and principal musician, One Hundred and Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Marion M. Luther, helpless and dependent daughter of Aldrich S. Luther, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Leona J. Strickland, widow of Theodore Strickland, late of Company B, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Catherine Green, former widow of Irwin H. Rose, late of the band, Third Brigade, Second Division, Twentieth

Army Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Pooler, widow of William J. Pooler, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henrietta M. Peavey, widow of George S. Peavey, late of Company B, One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 9484) entitled "An Act to amend section 36 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. McADOO, Mr. STEIWER and Mr. CAREY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL UNITED STATES JUDGES

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 528.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order for the Committee on the Judiciary to call up for consideration, without the intervention of any point of order, the following bills:

S. 3389. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the southern district of New York.

S. 2075. An act to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern and western districts of Missouri.

S. 2137. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern, northern, and western districts of Oklahoma.

S. 2456. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia.

H. R. 11072. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

H. R. 3043. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia.

Each such bill when called up shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. After general debate on each such bill, which shall continue not to exceed 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill for the consideration of a number of judgeship bills.

Mr. Speaker, there have been reported out a number of bills providing for additional Federal judgeships. Application was made to the Rules Committee to bring out a rule for the consideration of these bills because objection had been made to them when they appeared on the Consent Calendar. After thorough consideration for nearly 3 days the Rules Committee granted a rule for the consideration of only those judgeship bills which were approved by the Judicial Council, composed of the senior circuit judges of the Federal courts and the Chief Justice of the United States. All of these bills were reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary and a number of bills presented to the Rules Committee were not reported. After thorough analysis these bills were considered important enough to be brought up before the House.

The situation is that should Congress adjourn and Federal judges be appointed there is no provision to pay their salaries until they are confirmed in the next Congress. The matter is an emergency one, therefore.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

NEW YORK MINIMUM-WAGE LAW

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is a proper and appropriate time, when we are considering an omnibus bill to increase the number of Federal judges, to

discuss the 5-to-4 decision which was handed down by the Supreme Court yesterday holding unconstitutional the minimum-wage law for women and children in the State of New York.

I doubt if there is any Member of the House who feels more strongly and who has spoken more often in defense of the Constitution, the powers of the Supreme Court, and against the delegation of legislative powers by the Congress and the invasion of State rights by congressional action. I doubt if there is any Member of Congress who has made more speeches throughout the country in defense of our capitalistic and our American system, based upon private initiative and reasonable profit. In the years I have been in public life I have always stood for social and industrial justice under the Constitution. I agree with Abraham Lincoln that labor is prior to capital and that human rights are superior to property rights. I believe that the best way to combat socialism and communism is to provide a square deal for labor and social and industrial justice for all American wage earners. I am frankly shocked by this unfortunate 5-to-4 decision that compels millions of loyal Americans to work for wages that will not secure for them the common necessities of life.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. If the gentleman is going to make an attack upon the Supreme Court, he ought not to do it out of order.

Mr. FISH. I have not the slightest intention of doing that.

Mr. BLANTON. Especially when the gentleman is a candidate for the Presidency of the United States.

Mr. FISH. I assure the gentleman from Texas I do not propose under any circumstances, no matter what decision the Supreme Court may hand down, to make an attack at any time upon the Supreme Court.

I must confess, however, that I am proud of the vote cast by Chief Justice Hughes and Justices Stone and Cardozo, all three from New York State, to sustain the New York State minimum-wage law and the reasons presented for their vote.

I propose to offer a constitutional amendment to permit the States to set up a minimum wage scale for women and minors. When the Congress has no such power conferred upon it by the Constitution and when the Supreme Court holds that the States have no power, then that power is reserved to the people, and the people have the right to amend the Constitution. I know of no Member of Congress who has ever claimed that the people have not the right to amend the Constitution in an orderly and proper way; that is, by a two-thirds vote of the Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the State legislatures.

When the Dred Scott case was passed upon by the Supreme Court, Abraham Lincoln publicly opposed the decision, yet Lincoln believed the Constitution was all the law and the prophets. He criticized the decision, but he did not resist it, and no one should resist this 5-to-4 verdict. The decision of the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land, and it stands as such until amended in an orderly way. However, the Supreme Court has presented the American people with a new Dred Scott decision condemning millions of Americans to economic slavery, and the issue will not be down until it has been righted in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, there is no recourse now for these 3,000,000 wage earners, women and children, who come under the minimum-wage laws of the various States, until a constitutional amendment has been ratified giving the States the power to protect women and minors from exploitation by chisellers and human rats who squeeze the economic lifeblood out of women, young girls, and children in my State and other States, and I speak for the greatest industrial State in the Union. Women and children in the city of New York and upstate receive \$8, \$9, and \$10 a week, far below a living wage scale, and are the prey of human vultures who exploit them. They do not receive enough to buy adequate food and milk, to say nothing of the other common necessities of life.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to criticize the Supreme Court, and I do not propose to do it. However, I am going to try to remedy the situation so that the women and children, and if necessary underpaid men, may be protected so that they

will receive a minimum and fair wage scale. Every civilized country in Europe for years has had minimum-wage standards. Now, the Supreme Court has ruled that the States have no right to protect women and children from economic exploitation and pauperized labor.

I am thoroughly consistent when I stand here making this plea, because I have upheld the Supreme Court on every occasion it has held legislation unconstitutional as being a delegation of power or an invasion of State rights. The Republican Party back in 1860 emancipated 3,000,000 colored slaves. The time has come now for both parties, irrespective of partisanship, to emancipate 3,000,000 white American slaves, women and children who are destitute and in need, because they are being exploited by our industrial system. Now, without any protection whatsoever in 18 industrial States there will be further exploitation, and naturally an appeal should be made in the Congress of the United States because we alone can initiate a constitutional amendment. We do not propose to condemn a large part of our people to perpetual poverty, squalor, undernourishment, and destitution through inaction or neglect.

I have an amendment here which I introduced today:

House Joint Resolution 618

To amend the Constitution empowering each State to fix minimum rates of wages of women and minors employed in industry

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed in addition to, and amendment of, the Constitution of the United States of America, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"Each State shall have power to fix fair minimum rates of wages for women and minors employed in industry for service of equivalent value."

Also, I have introduced another resolution (H. J. Res. 620) providing for an amendment to the Constitution empowering each State to fix minimum rates of wages for all persons, including men, women, and children employed in industry.

That is all that is necessary. From my long service in this House I know that any constitutional amendment which I suggest or offer will not be adopted by the majority Members of the House, but I hope some Democrat will introduce it tomorrow and make a fight for such a constitutional amendment. I hope immediate hearings will be held, and that an effort will be made to pass a joint resolution during the present session of Congress.

I say to my Republican friends if you lend or express any sympathy for this decision of the Supreme Court or try to evade it, it will mean a million votes for the Democratic Party. As far as I am concerned, I propose to go before the national convention of the Republican Party at Cleveland or the proper committee to urge that such an amendment be incorporated in their national platform and try to take this proposed amendment out of politics by having both parties endorse it.

This was not a New Deal measure. The minimum-wage law has been advocated by Republican Congresses and Republican legislatures for years. It should not be brought into politics at all, and it is up to the Republicans to see that it is not confused with recent unconstitutional measures that have been passed by Congress and so held by the Supreme Court.

Mr. EKWALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. EKWALL. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I think he will not find a dissenting voice on the Republican side of the House if he introduces such a measure.

Mr. FISH. I am introducing it today.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. If the Congress should fix a minimum wage, that would become the maximum, would it not?

Mr. FISH. It would not.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me ask the gentleman one further question: Suppose business or industry cannot stay in opera-

tion and pay the minimum wage that might be fixed by a legislature or by the Congress, but could stay in business by paying some less than the minimum wage fixed by the legislature, would the gentleman rather have the employers in business and have the people in employment earning something or be out of employment and have the employers also go out of business?

Mr. FISH. Since you ask me that question, I will go much further and say that I am not only advocating in this amendment a minimum wage for women and children, but I personally favor a minimum wage for all individuals—men, women, and children—for the States to pass upon themselves. If I thought it could be adopted I would go much further and put in a constitutional amendment giving Congress the right to enact a Federal minimum-wage law. I would like to vote for a Federal living wage of not less than \$20 in order to keep up our American standard of wages and make America a place worth living in for all of our people.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if my distinguished colleague from New York will yield a moment further, the gentleman knows from long business experience that we cannot have employees without having employers, and whenever you enact a law that puts employers out of business you put both of them—employers and employees—out of business and fix it so that employees do not have jobs.

Mr. FISH. I am pleased that the gentleman has asked that question, and I know he did so sincerely, and there is a very definite answer to it, which is simply this: The employers are not opposing this law; it is only the cutthroats or the chisellers, and not the big employers of labor, and not even the smaller employers of labor. It is just the blood-suckers; and I may say to the gentleman that you would find that 90 percent of the employers of labor in favor of a minimum-wage scale in the industrial States of the Union. It does not affect agriculture. I cannot speak for the other States, but I do know that in New York State, so far as the employers of labor are concerned, over 90 percent of them would favor a minimum-wage scale law in the States, and a good many of them would favor such a Federal law. You would thereby raise your standard of living; you would pay more wages to labor and give them money to spend, so they could buy the products of agriculture—milk, meat, foodstuffs, dairy products, and other necessities of life.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. GREENWOOD. And is it not a further answer to the question of the gentleman from Texas that if any employer finds he cannot conduct a business and pay a living wage in America he ought to get out of business?

Mr. FISH. Now, you raise a question that I did not want to answer, as it brings up the tariff issue.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the main trouble now. We have been passing laws that have forced hundreds, and even thousands, of employers to go out of business, and when they closed shop it left millions of employees without jobs.

Mr. FISH. There is another objection that could be raised by the gentleman from Texas, and that is that the foreigners then would dump their goods into the United States. I am in favor of protecting the American market for the products of American wage earners. I am for high enough protection to prevent any such dumping in the United States. I would be in favor of preserving the home market for American labor and employing American labor at American standard of wages.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Would not a constitutional amendment calling for the same terms to be applied to all employers in a competitive market for labor answer the question that has been raised by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. FISH. Certainly; the whole idea is to have honest competition and not cutthroat competition.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. I would like to commend the gentleman for his statement that he believes we should have an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting Congress to fix minimum wages and fix hours of employment.

Mr. FISH. Let us take one step at a time.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does not the gentleman think that this is too important an issue to compromise by offering the amendment in a narrow form?

Mr. FISH. No; because I have been in politics long enough to know that it is better to get half a loaf rather than nothing at all or waiting for years and years.

Mr. BOILEAU. Once that provision went into the Constitution, it would take a good many years before the people would agree to accept a real amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. FISH. I do not agree with that philosophy at all. I think there is need in the country today for this minimum-wage amendment, and if the Democratic majority took up my proposed amendment or any similar amendment, they could put it through before we adjourned and put it up to the States, and it would go through automatically and be ratified within a comparatively short time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman agree with the principle, along the line of the argument he is making, that there ought to be an amendment of the Federal Constitution that would give the Congress the right and the authority to regulate wages and working conditions?

Mr. FISH. No; I never said that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, what is the gentleman's attitude on that proposition?

Mr. FISH. That is an entirely different issue, and I have not favored that and I do not favor it now; but I will make this statement: If there are many more decisions of the kind that was handed down yesterday by the Supreme Court, naturally I would be compelled to change my views.

Mr. FORD of California. There does not need to be any more such decisions.

Mr. FISH. Up to this time I have been absolutely against such a proposition, because I think the States ought to regulate such matters. I still believe this; but if the Supreme Court comes along and holds that the States have no power to regulate their own wages and working conditions, then we will have to do something about it; but we have not as yet reached that stage.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman will yield, what is the difference in the logic of the situation? If the States should be given the power, as the gentleman has indicated in his proposed amendment, why should not the power be conferred upon the Congress to regulate matters affecting interstate commerce with reference to labor conditions? What is the difference of reasoning?

Mr. FISH. I am in favor of giving the States power to establish minimum wages, and that is the issue, and it will be easy to put through. I say to you as the leader of your party in the House that if you take this up you could put it through. You would not dare to take up your other proposal to confer power on Congress to regulate wages and labor conditions, as that is an invasion of State rights.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Under the last decisions of the Supreme Court are there any State rights left?

Mr. FISH. It only decided this one issue. If you believe, as I believe, that men, women, and children are being systematically exploited in America and we can help them, it is our duty to help them. But if we do not help them we will be playing into the hands of the Communists, Socialists, and other radicals, who say that the Constitution is a scrap of paper, merely representing wealth, reaction, and special privilege.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I agree with the gentleman that something should be done about it. At the moment I do not go any further than to say that the State should be authorized to deal with the question, because I am one of the sole survivors of the State-rights doctrine.

Mr. FISH. There are plenty on the Republican side.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman will admit that in the Legislature of the State of New York, of which the gentleman was a distinguished member and I was a mere member, that the Democratic Party in that State has led the fight and done everything in its power to pass this legislation, which was signed by a Democratic Governor.

Mr. FISH. I admit that and I commend you; but, in all fairness, there was a Republican legislature. However, it is all the more reason why you should proceed now to help put through an adequate constitutional amendment.

Mr. RAMSAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RAMSAY. I believe the gentleman is supporting the Borah candidacy for President. What about the Borah amendment, which would require a decision by seven judges to two to set aside an act of Congress?

Mr. FISH. I do not know anything about Senator BORAH offering any such amendment. I will say that there is no stronger supporter of the Constitution or the powers of the Supreme Court and against bureaucracy than Senator BORAH.

Let me go a little further, and give you a constitutional yardstick.

It does not make any difference whether a man is in the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the Socialist, or the Communist Party, there is a real test for radicalism. When you find a man like Senator BORAH, who upholds the Constitution and the powers of the Supreme Court and is against the delegation of powers by Congress and is in favor of State rights, that man is not a radical. When you find a man trying to destroy the Constitution, to undermine it and the powers of the Supreme Court, no matter whether he be a Republican, a Democrat, or what not, you can classify him as a radical—and half my Republican friends today believe Senator BORAH is a radical, and most unjustly and to their own great disadvantage, as he would otherwise be the Republican candidate for President and would be elected.

The fight for a constitutional amendment to give the States the right to enact minimum-wage laws has just begun. The American people will not permit the continuation of sweatshop wages in our American system or admit the fact that our Government is powerless to help solve this social and economic problem in an orderly way. They do not propose that American wage earners shall be crucified on a cross of economic slavery and human bondage without striving to correct this evil and wiping out this national disgrace by adopting a sound and sane constitutional amendment.

The best and easiest way to curb the growing power of monopoly and pass prosperity around among the underpaid wage earners by increasing their purchasing power is to expedite ratification of a constitutional amendment permitting the States to establish minimum-wage laws for men, women, and children on their own terms and volition, but most emphatically for women and children.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON].

REPRESENTATIVE RANDOLPH CARPENTER

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Kansas bill for an additional judgeship is not included in the rule before the House at this time. The Kansas bill has the endorsement of the Judicial Council and has passed the Senate. It is now going to die in the Rules Committee. But then I am rather glad that it did not come up now, because probably next session, if we come back, we may have a chance to recommend the appointment to a new Kansas Federal judgeship of our colleague, RANDOLPH CARPENTER, to whom I want to pay a tribute at this time.

CONGRESS LOSES

Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER] paid this body a very high tribute a few days ago, when announcing

his sincere regret upon retiring from the Halls of Congress to take up his duties as a lawyer and a private citizen in his native State of Kansas, by saying that it has been a great privilege to serve among us; and it is proper to say here and now that no man among us has served his district, his State, and the Nation with more unswerving devotion to duty, higher purpose, and more rugged honesty than RANDOLPH CARPENTER throughout his distinguished career of public service. It has been my privilege to closely associate and work with him during the past 2 years, and I am under lasting obligation to him for the always courteous, kindly advice and counsel given readily and freely. [Applause.]

He has been in every sense a national legislator. With him the welfare of the Nation as a whole outweighed the temporary welfare of any section or class. Yet, ever mindful of the welfare of his constituents at home, he is recognized as a man of exceptional ability and has the confidence and respect of Democrat and Republican alike. Through his exacting service as a conscientious Member of Congress he has maintained that human relationship of a genuine Representative which is as intimate as that of the doctor, the lawyer, the priest, or the minister.

He enlisted and fought in the World War and upon his return from France enlisted and fought in the public service. He will continue to carry on his high ideals, and I am confident that should he ever desire to serve as a public servant again, the people of Kansas will gladly and enthusiastically place him in any office to which he may aspire. He has won their admiration for the courage, fidelity to duty, and ability displayed in his work here under trying circumstances, and I know the Members of this body who, during the past 4 years, have enjoyed his bright, magnetic smile and sunny influence and unfailing kindness will long remember this stalwart Kansan for his high sense of duty, courage, and sterling character.

His record is one of faithful service to country in war and in peace. We bid him au revoir; we shall hear more of this distinguished colleague in the years to come whenever duty to friend and country calls. His retirement is a distinct loss to Kansas and the Nation; may it be only a temporary one, and may long-continued health, happiness, and prosperity be the lot of RANDOLPH CARPENTER, one of the most outstanding Representatives from the State of Kansas ever sent to Washington. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to make the observation that I feel that the gentleman's tribute to his colleague from Kansas is certainly a splendid one. But it is no greater tribute than our colleague who is leaving us deserves. I feel sure that the gentleman in paying this wonderful tribute to his colleague has expressed the sentiment of all Members of this House, irrespective of their political affiliations. RANDOLPH CARPENTER is not only a good lawyer, a splendid legislator, and a Christian gentleman, but he has demonstrated over and over again that his great heart beats in sympathy with the toiling masses. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EKWALL. And I rise to say that any time Kansas does not want RANDOLPH CARPENTER, just send him to Oregon and we will take him up there.

Mr. HOUSTON. And I thank the gentleman from Oregon. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

TWO ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 3389) to provide for the appointment of two additional judges

for the Southern District of New York, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in an endeavor to meet the objection raised by the gentleman from Michigan, that more time should be given to the consideration of bills of this sort, the Committee on the Judiciary sought a rule which would permit the consideration of bills for the appointment of nine Federal judges throughout the United States. In each instance the committee very carefully examined the needs, together with the report of the Judicial Council, and it was decided that the nine bills for which a rule was sought were the ones most needed throughout the United States. In every case the committee reported these bills unanimously.

In this particular bill, S. 3389, to provide for two additional judges for the southern district of New York, the former district attorney, Mr. Martin Conboy, and two of the judges from New York, appeared before our committee last year and pointed out conclusively the need for additional judges. I call the attention of the House to the fact that there are pending in that district, or were pending on June 30, 1935, 3,542 private cases, 913 civil cases in which the United States is a party, 499 criminal cases, aside from approximately 3,000 cases in bankruptcy.

It was utterly impossible to get a criminal case to trial in New York within 2 years, and I feel that the passage of this bill is absolutely necessary in order to see that justice is properly administered in New York. Each of the other bills provides for the appointment of judges where the condition of the trial lists, while not as congested as that in the southern district of New York, is such that the proper administration of justice is impossible. The Committee on the Judiciary very carefully inquired into the need for the creation of these additional judges and was guided by the report of the Judicial Council, recommendations of bar associations, judges, and litigants themselves. A great deal of very careful consideration was given every bill in an endeavor to present for the consideration of the House only those measures which provide for the appointments of judges where, in the opinion of the committee, the business of the courts can no longer be conducted promptly and properly without an increase in the number of judges.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk again reported the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I do this to make the observation that it appears, when Congress has nothing else to do, we meet here and create some more inferior Federal judgeships in this country, when for the welfare of the country it would be far better that we adjourn and go back to our homes. In regard to the bill under consideration providing for the appointment of two additional judges for the southern district of New York, it is very likely that there is greater need for two additional judges there than in certain other sections of the country.

Let me call attention to the fact that in this resolution an additional judgeship is created for Missouri. Missouri at the present time has a population of 4,000,000 and has four district judges. The State of Ohio, which I represent as Congressman at Large, has a population of 7,000,000 and has five district judges. There has been no complaint in Ohio that our Federal judges are overworked.

Oklahoma has a population of 2,000,000, and they have three district judges and are asking for an additional judge, as against 7,000,000 people in Ohio and five district judges; but I appreciate the fact that in Oklahoma they have Indian problems that we do not have in the State of Ohio.

In West Virginia, where they do not have any Indian litigation—which my colleague from Oklahoma would be giving

as the reason for an additional judge in Oklahoma, and there may be some merit to his claim—they are asking for an additional judge.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I decline to yield.

In West Virginia they have a population of 1,700,000, and they have two United States district judges at the present time. This bill, if enacted into law, will increase the district judges for the State of West Virginia and give them three district judges, with a population of less than 2,000,000.

Then in Georgia there are three district judges at the present time and there is a population of 3,000,000. This bill gives them an additional district judge.

In Pennsylvania, where they have eight district judges at the present time as against Ohio's five district judges, they have a population of 10,000,000 as against 7,000,000 in Ohio. This bill increases the number to nine district judges in Pennsylvania, and the reason given is that they have a judge there who is about 80 years old and who is not capable of transacting business but still insists upon holding court there.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his courtesy in yielding. In response to his suggestion that the number of Federal judges for Missouri is disproportionate to her population, may I call attention to the fact that litigation and the business of the courts, and the corresponding number of judges required for any particular State, is not determined by its population, but by the amount and character of its business and commerce. Missouri is not only a great manufacturing State but is also an important transportation center, as indicated by the heavy rail, highway, and river traffic converging at St. Louis, Kansas City, Hannibal, and St. Joseph. It is one of the notable banking and commercial centers of the Nation, and is the only State which has within its confines two Federal Reserve cities. Out of the 12 Federal Reserve cities in the United States, Missouri has 2, while only 10 other cities in the Union have 1 each. In addition to the large volume of business of the State, an additional burden has been thrown on the local Federal courts by the recent bankruptcy law. The railroad receiverships alone monopolize a large part of the time and attention of its courts, and the amount of business pressing upon the Federal judges of the State for administration and adjudication is so large that Judge Stone considers two additional judges for Missouri imperative and at least one indispensable. I ask that the bill S. 2075, to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, be called up next. It has been reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary and approved by the Rules Committee, largely through the interest and efforts of our colleague, Congressman COCHRAN of Missouri, and on that account I am certain will have the unanimous approval of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 10630) making appropriations

for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 24, 53, and 54 to the bill (H. R. 10630) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 24, 53, and 54.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
B. M. JACOBSEN,
JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,

Managers on the part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
GERALD P. NYE,
FREDERICK STEIWER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate (Nos. 24, 53, and 54) to the bill (H. R. 10630) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in connection with the action of the conferees on such amendments:

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments:

On no. 24: Relating to the construction and repair of certain irrigation systems on Indian reservations.

On no. 53: Authorizing the construction of various reclamation projects.

On no. 54: Making an appropriation for the construction of various reclamation projects.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
B. M. JACOBSEN,
JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,

Managers on the part of the House.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE FOR MISSOURI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2075) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional United States district judge, who shall be an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri. The judge so appointed shall at the time of his appointment be a resident and citizen of the State of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR OKLAHOMA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2137) to provide for the appointment of one additional judge for the eastern, northern, and western districts of Oklahoma.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional United States district judge, who shall be an additional district judge for the eastern, northern, and western districts of Oklahoma. The judge so appointed shall at the time of his appointment be a resident and citizen of the State of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE FOR WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2456) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized to appoint an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia, who shall, at the time of his appointment, be a resident and a citizen of the State of West Virginia; and who, when appointed and qualified as provided by law, shall exercise all the powers conferred by existing law upon judges of the District Courts of the United States; and who shall, as to all business and proceedings arising in said northern and southern districts of West Virginia, as now constituted or which may be transferred thereto, succeed to and possess the same powers and perform the same duties within said districts that are now possessed and performed by the district judges heretofore appointed for and now serving therein, respectively.

The present district judge for the northern district of West Virginia shall hold regular terms of court in said northern district, at the following places and times, that is to say:

(a) At the city of Martinsburg on the first Tuesday in April and the third Tuesday in September in each year;

(b) At the city of Wheeling on the first Tuesday in May and the third Tuesday in October in each year;

(c) At the city of Elkins on the third Tuesdays in June and November in each year;

(d) Said judge shall also hold such special terms as may be necessary for the orderly dispatch of the business of said court; the same to be held at said places and at such times as he shall appoint.

The present district judge for the southern district of West Virginia shall hold regular terms of court in said southern district at the following places and times, that is to say:

(a) At the city of Bluefield on the third Tuesdays in January and June in each year;

(b) At the city of Lewisburg on the first Tuesday in March and the third Tuesday in September in each year;

(c) At the city of Charleston on the third Tuesdays in April and November in each year;

(d) Said judge shall also hold such special terms as may be necessary for the orderly dispatch of the business of said court; the same to be held at said places and at such times as he shall appoint.

The district judge for the said northern and southern districts of West Virginia, to be appointed under this act, shall hold regular terms of court in said northern and southern districts at the following places and times; that is to say:

(a) At the city of Clarksburg, in said northern district, on the second Tuesdays in January and September in each year;

(b) At the city of Parkersburg, in said northern district, on the third Tuesday in March and the second Tuesday in October in each year;

(c) At the city of Huntington, in said southern district, on the second Tuesdays in May and November in each year;

(d) Said judge shall also hold such special terms as may be necessary for the orderly dispatch of the business of said court; the same to be held at said places and at such times as he shall appoint.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the President of the United States is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional United States district judge, who shall be an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia. Whenever a vacancy shall occur either in the office of the district judge for the northern district of West Virginia or in the office of the district judge for the southern district of West Virginia, whichever vacancy shall first occur, the judge appointed pursuant to the authority granted by this act shall become the district judge for the northern district of West Virginia or the district judge for the southern district of West Virginia, as the case may be, and no successor shall be appointed to the vacancy thus occurring in the position created by this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I renew the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdrew the demand for a quorum, but I ask unanimous consent that each Member be given permission to extend his remarks on the bills considered under the rule.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, to that I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 11072) authorizing the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and directed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint an additional district judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, who shall possess the same powers, perform the same duties, and receive the same compensation as the present district judges of the said district.

Sec. 2. That when a vacancy shall occur in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, by the retirement, disqualification, resignation, or death of a district judge at present in commission, such vacancy shall not be filled, and thereafter there shall be but three district judges in the said district.

Sec. 3. That this act shall take effect upon its approval by the President.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final enactment.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YOUNG) there were—ayes 67, noes 11.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present and make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House do now adjourn. The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 55, not voting 136, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—234

Adair	Clark, Idaho	Dondero	Goodwin
Allen	Cochran	Dorsey	Granfield
Andresen	Colden	Doughton	Gray, Pa.
Arends	Cole, N. Y.	Doxey	Greenwood
Bacharach	Cooley	Drewry	Greever
Bankhead	Cooper, Ohio	Driscoll	Gregory
Barry	Cooper, Tenn.	Driver	Griswold
Beam	Costello	Duffey, Ohio	Guyer
Bell	Cravens	Duffy, N. Y.	Haines
Blackney	Crawford	Duncan	Hancock, N. Y.
Bland	Creal	Dunn, Pa.	Hart
Blanton	Crosby	Eckert	Healey
Bloom	Crosser, Ohio	Edmiston	Hess
Boehne	Crowther	Ekwall	Higgins, Mass.
Boileau	Culkin	Ellenbogen	Hildebrandt
Boland	Cullen	Engel	Hobbs
Brewster	Curley	Evans	Holmes
Brooks	Daly	Farley	Hope
Buck	Darden	Ferguson	Houston
Burch	Deen	Flesinger	Imhoff
Burdick	Delaney	Flannagan	Jenckes, Ind.
Burnham	Dempsey	Focht	Jenkins, Ohio
Cannon, Mo.	DeRouen	Ford, Calif.	Johnson, Okla.
Carpenter	Dickstein	Frey	Johnson, W. Va.
Cartwright	Dies	Gassaway	Jones
Cavicchia	Dingell	Gavagan	Kahn
Chandler	Dirksen	Gilchrist	Keller
Chapman	Disney	Gildea	Kennedy, Md.
Citron	Dockweiler	Gingery	Kenney

Kinzer	Monaghan	Robson, Ky.	Taylor, Tenn.
Kocalkowski	Moran	Rogers, Mass.	Terry
Kopplemann	Mott	Rogers, Okla.	Thom
Kvale	Murdock	Romjue	Thomason
Larrabee	Nichols	Russell	Thompson
Lea, Calif.	Norton	Ryan	Tonry
Leibach	O'Brien	Sadowski	Turner
Lesinski	O'Connell	Sanders, Tex.	Turpin
Lewis, Colo.	O'Connor	Sauthoff	Umstead
Lewis, Md.	O'Day	Schuetz	Utterback
McClellan	O'Neal	Schulte	Vinson, Ga.
McCormack	Parsons	Scrugham	Vinson, Ky.
McGehee	Patman	Secrest	Wallgren
McKeough	Patton	Seger	Walter
McLaughlin	Pearson	Shanley	Warren
McLeod	Peyser	Shannon	Weaver
McReynolds	Pfeifer	Short	Welch
Maas	Pierce	Sisson	Whelchel
Mahon	Pittenger	Smith, Conn.	Whittington
Mapes	Powers	Smith, Va.	Wigglesworth
Marcantonio	Rabaut	Smith, Wash.	Williams
Marshall	Ramsay	Smith, W. Va.	Wilson, La.
Martin, Colo.	Ramspeck	South	Wilson, Pa.
Mason	Rankin	Spence	Wolcott
Massingale	Reece	Starnes	Wolverton
Maverick	Reed, Ill.	Steagall	Wood
May	Reed, N. Y.	Stubbs	Woodruff
Meeks	Rich	Sumners, Tex.	Zimmerman
Michener	Risk	Sutphin	
Millard	Robertson	Sweeney	

NAYS—55

Amlie	Crowe	Kelly	Peterson, Ga.
Ashbrook	Eicher	Kloeb	Pettengill
Bacon	Fish	Kniffin	Polk
Biermann	Fletcher	Knutson	Ransley
Binderup	Ford, Miss.	Lambertson	Reilly
Brown, Ga.	Fulmer	Lambeth	Scott
Buchanan	Gehrmann	Lamneck	Stefan
Buckler, Minn.	Gifford	Lemke	Taber
Carlson	Gray, Ind.	Luckey	Tarver
Castellow	Hill, Knute	Ludlow	Taylor, S. C.
Christianson	Hoffman	McFarlane	Thurston
Church	Hull	Main	Wearin
Collins	Jacobsen	Mitchell, Tenn.	Young
Colmer	Johnson, Tex.	Patterson	

NOT VOTING—136

Andrew, Mass.	Doutrich	Kerr	Quinn
Andrews, N. Y.	Dunn, Miss.	Kleberg	Randolph
Ayers	Eagle	Kramer	Rayburn
Barden	Eaton	Lanham	Richards
Belter	Englebright	Lee, Okla.	Richardson
Berlin	Faddis	Lord	Robinson, Utah
Bolton	Fenerty	Lucas	Rogers, N. H.
Boykin	Fernandez	Lundeen	Sabath
Boylan	Fitzpatrick	McAndrews	Sanders, La.
Brennan	Fuller	McGrath	Sandlin
Brown, Mich.	Gambrill	McGroarty	Schaefer
Buckley, N. Y.	Gasque	McLean	Schneider, Wis.
Bulwinkle	Gearhart	McMillan	Sears
Caldwell	Gillette	McSwain	Sirovich
Cannon, Wis.	Goldsborough	Maloney	Snell
Carmichael	Green	Mansfield	Snyder, Pa.
Carter	Greenway	Martin, Mass.	Somers, N. Y.
Cary	Gwynne	Mead	Stack
Casey	Halleck	Merritt, Conn.	Stewart
Celler	Hamlin	Merritt, N. Y.	Sullivan
Claiborne	Hancock, N. C.	Miller	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, N. C.	Harlan	Mitchell, Ill.	Tinkham
Coffee	Harter	Montague	Tobey
Cole, Md.	Hartley	Montet	Tolan
Connery	Hennings	Moritz	Treadway
Corning	Higgins, Conn.	Nelson	Wadsworth
Cox	Hill, Ala.	O'Leary	Werner
Cross, Tex.	Hill, Samuel B.	Oliver	West
Cummings	Hoeppe	O'Malley	White
Darrow	Hollister	Owen	Wilcox
Dear	Hook	Palmisano	Withrow
Dietrich	Huddleston	Parks	Wolfenden
Ditter	Kee	Peterson, Fla.	Woodrum
Dobbins	Kennedy, N. Y.	Plumley	Zioncheck

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. Corning with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Sears with Mr. Darrow.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. McAndrews with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Lord.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Patton with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Green with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Wilcox with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Kieberg with Mr. Merritt of Connecticut.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Carter.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. Mead with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Tobey.
Mr. Hill of Alabama with Mr. Wolfenden.
Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Lundeen.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Schneider of Wisconsin.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Stack.
Mr. Harlan with Mr. Carmichael.
Mr. Palmisano with Mr. Belter.
Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Kramer.
Mr. Connery with Mr. Snyder of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Tolan.
Mr. West with Mr. Merritt of New York.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Boylan.
Mr. Gambrell with Mr. O'Leary.
Mr. Caldwell with Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire.
Mr. Hennings with Mr. Coffee.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Somers of New York.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Dietrich.
Mr. Montet with Mr. Werner.
Mr. Dear with Mr. Fitzpatrick.
Mr. Terry with Mr. Sandlin.
Mr. Faddis with Mr. Claiborne.
Mr. Hook with Mr. O'Malley.
Mr. Berlin with Mr. Peterson of Florida.
Mr. Brennan with Mr. Randolph.
Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Cummings.
Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Gasque with Mr. Owen.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Harter.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Lucas.
Mr. Lee of Oklahoma with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Richardson with Mr. McSwain.
Mrs. Greenway with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Ayers with Mr. Parks.
Mr. Sam B. Hill with Mr. Sanders of Louisiana.
Mr. Cross with Mr. McGroarty.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3043) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

Mr. WHELCHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHELCHEL: Page 1, line 7, add the following: "That said additional judge shall be a resident of either Rome, Newnan, or Gainesville division of said district."

Mr. WHELCHEL. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I introduced a bill for the purpose of creating an additional district to be known as the northeastern district of Georgia, but my bill did not receive the approval of the Department of Justice. My colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] some time in May introduced a bill for the purpose of creating not an additional district but an additional judgeship. His bill received the approval of the Department and is the one now under consideration.

The purpose of my amendment is simply to restrict the selection of the judge to north Georgia, because I think north Georgia should be so recognized. I think just as good judges could be selected from Atlanta as from north Georgia, and it is not my purpose to fight this bill, but I think the selection should be made from the divisions set forth in my amendment.

It also appears to me that there is sufficient precedent for this request. I shall not, however, take the time of the House to read the precedents, but on numerous occasions restrictions have been written into similar bills, such as the requirement that the additional judge shall not live in the same county or the adjoining counties to that of the presiding judge.

I think that the matter may be better understood by referring to my amendment. I am not opposing the bill. I think we need some additional assistance in north Georgia, and that is why I introduced by bill, H. R. 10127. I hope, however, my amendment to H. R. 13042 will be adopted. Certainly I want an additional judge appointed for north Georgia, but I think from whence he shall come or be chosen should be restricted, and that is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Does the gentleman mean that a candidate, in order to be eligible for appointment, must live in one of these three places or after appointment he must take up his residence in one of these three places?

Mr. WHELCHER. There are four divisions in this district. Atlanta now has the judge from Fulton County, and I am asking in this amendment that the judge be required to reside now and maintain his residence in one of the other three divisions.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. In order to be eligible for appointment, must he live at one of those three places?

Mr. WHELCHER. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Does the gentleman think the President ought to be restrained in that way?

Mr. WHELCHER. I would not make this request if there were not precedents for it.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Is there a precedent for such amendment?

Mr. WHELCHER. Here it is. There was an additional judgeship created in the western district of New York by an act of Congress dated March 3, 1927, Forty-fourth Statutes, 1370, and there is contained therein this language: "That the official residence of such judges shall not be in the same or adjoining counties."

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Residence is one thing and eligibility for appointment is another.

Mr. WHELCHER. Not only is it true in that instance, but here is another proposition having to do with an additional judgeship being northern district of New York, March 3, 1927, chapter 338, Forty-fourth Statutes, 1374, which reads as follows: "That the official residence of said judges shall not be in the same or adjoining counties." If I have not made myself clear, may I say that the selection of the judge may be from one of the other three districts, not from the district where the present judge now resides.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think there is some confusion. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes to answer my most distinguished friend.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I suggest to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHELCHER] there is a difference between limiting the discretion of the President in the selection of a judge and fixing the official residence of the judge who may be selected. Does not the gentleman think he will get into some constitutional difficulties if he undertakes to territorially limit the President with regard to an appointment?

Mr. WHELCHER. I would not attempt to advise the gentleman from Texas, because he knows so much more about that than I do.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I suggest to the gentleman, and I am trying to help him, that his amendment, with all deference, should provide that the judge shall live in some territory rather than that he shall be selected from a particular territory.

Mr. WHELCHER. Here is the amendment as I had it originally prepared:

The official residence of the said additional judge and the present judge for said district shall not be in the same or adjoining counties.

What is the difference? I may be entirely wrong about this matter. I am open to conviction.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does not the gentleman fear he will be endangering this bill with reference to the constitutionality feature by restricting the power of the President?

Mr. WHELCHER. No. That is not the purpose of the bill. The purpose is to attempt to get a judge appointed from one of these three districts instead of from Atlanta, Ga. That is the whole purpose.

Mr. COCHRAN. Are we creating a judgeship for an individual to get a job, or because an additional judge is needed?

Mr. WHELCHER. There are four divisions in the northern district of Georgia, and I think it fair and equitable the additional judge should be selected from some place other than Atlanta, and certainly I have no candidate for the job.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my amendment be adopted. It is equitable, and I think justifiable under the circumstances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we are having a little illustration this afternoon of old-fashioned Georgia politics. Atlanta happens to be the capital of the State of Georgia, and about one-tenth of the population of the State lives there. Seventy-five percent or more of the lawyers who practice in this judicial district reside in Atlanta, and more than 75 percent of the business that the court has in this judicial circuit comes from Atlanta.

I have no objection to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHELCHER] offering this amendment. Frankly, I think the gentleman from Texas has directed attention to the principal point. This is an unconstitutional limitation upon the power of the President and what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHELCHER] is seeking to accomplish is to keep an Atlanta lawyer from being appointed.

Mr. Speaker, I have no candidate for this office, and I will not be consulted with reference to the matter. Senators are the only ones consulted about these things. Atlanta is the point where the business is transacted; it is the point where the business originates, and it is the point where we need the services of this additional judge, and where he would have to be located if appointed from some other section of the State.

Presiding Circuit Judge Foster has stated that seven times in the last year it has been necessary for him to assign visiting judges to Atlanta to serve in this judicial circuit.

I therefore hope the Members of the House will not put this limitation in the bill. I do not think the President ought to be restricted or limited. I think if he finds the best lawyer in another county of the judicial circuit he ought to have the right to go there and get him, whether it be Gainesville, Rome, or Atlanta. I do not think the lawyers in my district ought to be discriminated against in favor of those residing in the district represented by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHELCHER], or the district represented by Mr. TARVER, or any other district. I think the President should not be limited in his power to select the best man he can get.

Mr. WHELCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHELCHER. May I ask the gentleman if the present judge was not a resident, at the time he was selected for his position, of the gentleman's district?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. He was appointed by President Hoover, and he was a resident of the district which I represent. But let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that his predecessor, Judge Sibley, now on the circuit court of appeals, was not from Atlanta.

Mr. WHELCHER. I have no candidate for the job, but I think it is just an equitable situation that should be agreed to. One man should come from one end, and one from the other.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The last one before Judge Underwood, came from Union Point, Ga., which is now in the district of my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], and he made a splendid judge, and if the President sees fit to go outside of Atlanta, I have no objection, but I do not propose to stand idly by and see the lawyers in my district discriminated against, and I do not think it is good practice for the President to be limited in his selection of a Federal judge. The Lord knows we need some better ones than we have been getting in the past. I hope the House will vote down the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words of the amendment.

While I am in sympathy with the idea that my colleague is seeking to have incorporated in the bill by this amendment, I am not of the opinion that the amendment is properly worded or in line with the precedents to which he has referred.

For 2 months I have been in conference with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee at various times and with other members of the committee in an effort to secure a hearing by the subcommittee which reported this bill in order that there might be worked out by this subcommittee a limitation in proper language with regard to the official residence of the judge. Through misunderstanding, for which the chairman of the full committee is in no way to blame, the bill was reported without such a hearing.

I do not think we can require that the appointee shall be a resident of any particular area at the time of appointment. I do think that under the precedents referred to by my colleague, we can require that his official residence shall be in a certain division or in an area composed of certain counties and the President would doubtless accept this as a suggestion by Congress that when appointed the judge should be a legal resident of that area. This is important not only from the standpoint of furnishing an opportunity for lawyers from every part of the district to receive consideration in the filling of positions of this sort rather than that residents of one large city in the district should receive preferential consideration, but in order that the citizens of every part of the district may be as conveniently located as possible with reference to the official residence of a judge of the district. But I believe the matter ought to be carefully worked out. The precedents referred to by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHELOHEL], and set out at page 1225 of the Code of the United States, contains limitations as to the official residence of the appointees and not as to their legal residence at the time of appointment. The requirement is—

The official residences of the two judges in the western district of New York shall not be in the same or adjoining counties (U. S. Code, title 28, pt. 1, ch. 1, sec. 1).

I am very much impressed with the opinion that this bill will not be enacted into law during the present session of the Congress. I have every reason to believe it will not be passed by the Senate. It is not necessary to go into a discussion of the reasons which lead me to this conclusion, but I think the proper thing to do at this time would be to vote down this amendment in order that when the bill is reintroduced next year, the Committee on the Judiciary may afford a hearing to those of us who are interested in the incorporation in the bill of an amendment carrying into effect the idea of my colleague from Georgia [Mr. WHELOHEL] and may work out a proper amendment in line with the precedents that exist in other judicial districts in the country.

So I hope the amendment in its present verbiage will be rejected by the House in order that the matter may be left open for disposition next year, upon the justified assumption that this particular legislation will not be finally enacted during the present session.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proforma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak briefly and to the point, and I am not going to advert to Georgia politics. I am sure

that practically all of us would like to have both of our colleagues pleased and render them helpful service in helping some fine, outstanding lawyer in their respective constituencies receive a lifetime job at the public trough and then, upon retirement at the age of 70, receive a pension of \$10,000 as long as he lives; but my study of this proposal leads me to the certain knowledge that there is no necessity for an additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia.

Georgia has three district judges at the present time, with a population approaching 3,000,000. My own State of Ohio, a great industrial and agricultural State, with a population of 7,000,000, has only five district judges; and back in 1932, for the year ending June 30, 1932, there were pending in the United States Court for the Northern District of Georgia 1,029 cases. At the same period for the year ending June 30, 1935, in the same district, there were pending only 517 cases, or approximately one-half the number. In 1932 there were pending at the end of the year 225 lawsuits of a private character, 219 civil cases in which the United States was a party, and 585 criminal cases, while at the end of the year 1935 there were pending only 133 private cases, as against 225; 156 civil cases to which the United States was a party, as against 219 3 years before; and of criminal cases there were only 228, as compared with 585 for the period ending in 1932.

Hence there would seem absolutely no reason whatever for this Congress in its closing hours to be called upon to supply at the public trough and at the expense of the taxpayers of this country an additional judge for the northern district of Georgia.

It would seem to those of us who have given careful consideration to bills of this character that there is absolutely less merit to this section of the bill we are voting on today, this particular bill, than any other bill we have voted on.

Personally, I am opposed to the inferior Federal judiciary. If I had my way, I would do away with the inferior Federal judges and have all constitutional questions taken directly to the Supreme Court of our country.

But probably I am prejudiced. I am opposed to these tyrannical Federal district judges who pay no attention to anyone, who are judges, jurors, and executioners combined in one individual.

But, Mr. Speaker, looking at this in an impartial way, when I consider the population of Georgia and the present number of United States district judges and all the surrounding sections, it would seem to me that the proper thing would be to vote against the amendment and then vote against the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words. During the discussion of the previous bill I was told a story by one of the Representatives from a Midwestern State. He said there was a bill up for the appointment of another judge in that State. As it happened, the district judge did not want another judge appointed.

The argument in favor of the new judge was that the docket was overloaded with cases. So this judge who did not want the new one appointed immediately got busy and cleared the docket, so that there was no need of another judge being appointed.

I thought that that might be possible in some of these districts where they are clamoring for new judges. We have established eight new judges, and here is another one, which will make nine. Each of these judges will receive \$10,000 a year. That means \$90,000. We have created these new judgeships, and they will last, say, 20 years, and in that time you will get up quite a sizable bill. Every time an authorization for expenditure is brought up one of our political Members gets up and says, "Where are you going to get the money?"

Today we had a bill under consideration to establish a new judgeship in the State of Pennsylvania, and that very energetic gentleman who is always protecting the Treasury voted for the establishment of that new judgeship in the State of Pennsylvania. I ask him—and he was here a moment ago—where he is going to get the money for the new judge in the State of Pennsylvania?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia?

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution was laid on the table.

INVITING FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO PARTICIPATE IN SAN FRANCISCO BAY EXPOSITION

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 226, authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the San Francisco Bay Exposition in 1939 at San Francisco, Calif., which I send to the desk and ask to have read, and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read and that the whereases be omitted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 226, and that the whereases be omitted. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and respectfully requested by proclamation, or in such manner as he may deem proper, to invite all foreign countries and nations to such proposed exposition with a request that they participate therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, after the word "invite", strike out the word "all."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to; and the Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

INVITING FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 267, authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the New York World's Fair 1939, Inc., in the city of New York during the year 1939, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 267, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and respectfully requested, by proclamation or in such manner as he may deem proper, to invite foreign countries and nations to such proposed world's fair with a request that they participate therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution was ordered to lie on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress it shall be in order for the majority leader or the chairman of the Committee on Rules to move that the House take a recess, and that said motion is hereby made of the highest privilege; and it shall also be in order at any time during the remainder of the second session of the Seventy-fourth

Congress to consider reports of the Committee on Rules as provided in clause 45, rule XI, except that the provision requiring a two-thirds vote to consider such reports is hereby suspended during the remainder of the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the leader of the majority, have discussed this resolution with the leader of the minority, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], and that it is satisfactory to him.

I have discussed it also with the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, I think this should stand over until tomorrow. There was much said about gag rule in the last session. Now, this is a gag rule. There is not any question about it. I may not object to it, but I am not going to sit here and permit a rule of this kind to go through by unanimous consent and then later have the Members say they did not know what was being done. I ask the gentleman to withdraw his request for the present.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, no. I shall not withdraw it.

Mr. MICHENER. I object.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment? The gentleman is a good parliamentarian, and I desire to explain the situation to him.

Mr. MICHENER. I know what this rule is.

Mr. O'CONNOR. This is the usual resolution that is introduced toward the close of every session of Congress. There is no gag in it, in the sense that I ever heard the word "gag" used. The rule merely permits recessing. It provides that a rule, instead of standing over 1 day, can be brought up on the same day it is reported. Now, what "gag" is there in that?

Mr. MICHENER. It means this, that ordinarily the House has some right to know something about what is coming up for consideration. This means that a rule may be brought in at any time and without notice, therefore, every Member must remain on the floor all the time, every minute, and without any knowledge of what is coming before the House. In addition this resolution does away with the two-thirds vote.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is unduly excited, especially because he sits on the minority side of the House, and the prime purpose of this suggestion is to permit the minority to attend a certain conclave to be held in Cleveland, where they are going to make certain misstatements to the country. [Laughter.] That is the sole purpose of the resolution. The other item is incidental.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the Rules Committee this question: I appreciate the fact that the membership of the House is in very bad circumstances. We have some of them over in an institution for examination. We have others who have been in the hospital. I question very much whether the chairman of the Rules Committee and the majority leader ought not to take charge of the membership of this House, so that they will not bring in any more ridiculous bills.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have one Member particularly in mind of whom we would like to take charge, so that we could expedite the business of the House. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I shall object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I intend to object to any further legislation tonight. We have had a long day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman there are some conference reports to be filed.

Mr. MAPES. I will not object to those.

REGISTRATION OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN LOBBYING

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 11663) to require reports of receipts and disbursements of certain contributions, to require the registration of persons engaged in attempting to influence legislation, to prescribe punishments for violations of this act, and for other purposes.

CHALMETTE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5368) to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chalmette National Monument in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DEROUEN, Mr. KNUTE HILL, and Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT.

THE TOWNSEND PLAN

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. MCGROARTY] I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record a speech on the Townsend plan prepared by him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGROARTY. Mr. Speaker, only the insistence of my colleagues in Congress and the duty I owe to the millions of good people throughout the country who have placed their hopes for the future in the success of the McGroarty bill prompts me to make a public statement of the break between Dr. F. E. Townsend and myself. My thoughts and efforts are now, and have been, concerned solely with the passage of the McGroarty bill, H. R. 7154, which embodies the Townsend plan and is the only bill before Congress which does so. I believe every member of a Townsend club shares my opinion that the passage of this legislation should be the sole purpose of Dr. Townsend and the O. A. R. P. organization.

I further believe that every club member agrees that Dr. Townsend has recently been receiving bad advice which led him away from the real purpose of this movement and set him to chasing rainbows. Let us stick to the job we started until we finish it before we tackle the "remaking of the world." Let us attend to our own problems of old-age security and unemployment before we bother with foreign affairs; yes, and let us do it without getting embroiled in politics or we will never get it done. The self-seeking politicians who have gotten Dr. Townsend's ear the last few months and who have supplanted the saner and sounder advice of Clements, under which he was proceeding, have conceived the idea of enlisting the Townsendites in a third party move.

Early in January, this year, the press called upon me with the information that Dr. Townsend had just given out a statement that he was launching a third party, and that petitions were being circulated in the State of California so that this party might appear on the ballot. This was the first intimation I had that such a move was really seriously contemplated by Townsend, because there had been two such third party announcements and retractions by him in as many months, and I believe there would be a similar retraction once the clear thinking strategy of the movement was brought into play. This last announcement has also been retracted but not until thousands of petitions were uselessly circulated in California, and a considerable amount of money was needlessly expended.

Dr. Townsend being in Washington at the time, I contacted him by telephone and ascertained that what the reporters had told me was correct. I promptly informed him that in my opinion this was a bad move and cited for his benefit the history of failures of third-party movements in this country. I also stated to him that I would have nothing to do with the venture and that he could not count on my support.

Mr. Robert E. Clements, co-founder of Old Age Revolving Pensions, Ltd., was ill in Chicago at the time of this third-

party announcement by Dr. Townsend. Mr. Clements got up out of a sick bed and rushed to Washington to try to get Dr. Townsend to change his mind about turning this great movement into a political set-up when we were so close to the goal. A meeting was called of the congressional bloc favoring the McGroarty bill, H. R. 7154, which is the Townsend plan in legislative form, and Dr. Townsend, Mr. Clements, and Mr. Gomer Smith were present. It was quickly made plain to Townsend that in launching this third-party movement he had made a mistake and the following day he released a statement to the press to the effect that he abandoned the idea. The whole incident, of course, was unfortunate, as it created considerable confusion in the minds of the Townsend-plan supporters both in Congress and in the field.

My friends, within less than 3 weeks after Congress convened this session, Dr. Townsend returned to California to be near Edward J. Margett and Sheridan Downey, now his personal attorney, for advice along political lines. If Townsend were truly interested in the passage of this legislation, I say he should have remained in Washington and cooperated with Mr. Clements, the cofounder of this movement, and with the Members of Congress who were endeavoring to enact into law the McGroarty bill. We in Congress who were favorable to the bill found it necessary to hold many conferences to discuss and plan strategy that might successfully guide the bill through the legislative machinery.

These conferences resulted in ever increasing demands for factual information from Townsend headquarters here. These demands were ably met by Mr. Clements, who cooperated with our congressional bloc in every way possible, and who was available at all times day or night to assist us. It was a source of considerable annoyance to both our congressional bloc and to Mr. Clements that Dr. Townsend was not here on the ground. On several occasions it was suggested to Mr. Clements by friendly Congressmen that Dr. Townsend was not sincerely working in the interest of the movement by remaining in California. Mr. Clements replied that he was well aware of this feeling, but that despite his urgent requests Dr. Townsend refused to come to Washington.

I wonder if Dr. Townsend's refusal to come to Washington and work with the Congress here for the passage of the McGroarty bill could possibly mean that for one reason or another it was not his sincere desire that the McGroarty bill be enacted into law at this session of Congress.

My friends, while Dr. Townsend might not have been any material help here in Washington, most certainly his absence gave the enemies of the plan abundant reason to question the legislative sincerity of the movement, and greatly embarrassed the movements of friendly Congressmen.

Very shortly after Townsend returned to California there appeared a book written by Mr. Sheridan Downey and strongly endorsed by Dr. Townsend in a foreword. Townsend's endorsement of this book, which proposed ideas contrary to the McGroarty bill, was to all purposes an abandonment of the Townsend plan as set forth in the McGroarty bill, H. R. 7154. It did not seem to matter to Townsend that the McGroarty bill, H. R. 7154, was the official bill of the Townsend movement and had been drawn and approved by a committee selected by national headquarters and including Townsend and Clements. I sponsored this bill because it was, and still is, the official legislative form of the Townsend plan.

The fact that Townsend, in the foreword of Downey's book, declared himself "not entirely committed to the transaction tax" and mentioned a \$10,000,000,000 bond issue to finance the "social dividends", which he, at the suggestion of Downey, has decided to call the annuities or pensions, as specified in the McGroarty bill, the fact that Townsend, in the same foreword, which he has signed, suggests that the age limit start at the age of 75 instead of 60 years, and the fact that Townsend has done nothing to promote the passage or increase the interest in Congress of the McGroarty bill at this session should prove to any thinking person that Townsend has aban-

done the McGroarty bill and is subverting the approved official legislative effort of the entire Townsend movement to the ideas and personal political ambitions of one man.

Contrary to what Townsend has given out to the press, the true reasons for the break between us were those I have just mentioned—namely, Townsend's insistent demand for the formation of a third party, Townsend's lack of sufficient interest in the success of our efforts to push the McGroarty bill forward in this session of Congress, as shown by his refusal to remain in Washington during this session, and Townsend's abandonment of the real Townsend plan and substituting therefor the Downey plan. These three very important issues were the ones upon which I differed with Townsend and were of fundamental importance to the success of our legislation.

Dr. Townsend gave out the information to the press that our differences arose over what he chose to term my "political ambitions", because I had allowed my name to be used in the California Democratic Presidential primary. This action on my part should have proved that instead of my having "political ambitions", I was willing to sacrifice not alone my so-called "political ambitions" but my standing with the present administration by daring to oppose the slate officially endorsed by the President. It was well known by national headquarters of the Townsend organization and by Mr. Clements that I did not hope or even dream of becoming a candidate for the Presidency, but I did hope and was willing to risk a great deal to try and bring the Townsend plan program to the floor of the Democratic national convention. This, and this alone, was my sole purpose in allowing my name to head a slate of delegates to that convention. My slate of delegates was the only one that was pledged to the Townsend plan, and only personal jealousy and not the good of the Townsend movement could have prompted Townsend to refuse to support this slate.

Dr. Townsend's frantic opposition to my well-meant intentions came without so much as a note of inquiry, much less a conference with him as to my purposes. I could not understand his attitude at the time, but I have since learned that my announcement came only a few days prior to a long-planned announcement by him declaring himself for the Presidency of the United States. When I learned these facts, I well understood that Townsend's opposition was caused by the jealousy that is born of thwarted desire. Unlike Dr. Townsend, I have no political ambitions and never did have, and I have never deserted the Townsend movement, but he did when he went over to the Downey plan.

I would like here to tell you of a matter which is vitally important to you. It is a matter in which I feel that Dr. Townsend either acted unwisely or, as I have previously stated, was ill-advised by his new advisers, who fanned the flame of unwarranted jealousy of Mr. Clements which was growing in Townsend's mind ever since the Chicago convention last fall. Dr. Townsend has been jealous of Mr. Clements because you Townsendites showed appreciation for his sincere efforts in this movement. Townsend should be so ashamed of himself and should get on his knees and beg forgiveness, because Clements made Townsend what he is today. Clements built this organization; Townsend did not, and Townsend knows it; but just as soon as the people began to find it out, Townsend wanted to get rid of Clements. And so the resignation of the cofounder of this movement was forced, and the selection by Dr. Townsend of a so-called national board of directors took place just prior to the investigation of the leadership of the Townsend movement by a congressional committee.

It is generally recognized by all who are close to the scene, that when the movement lost Clements they lost the real strategist, the man who had built the organization to such magnificent proportions, an organization considered by many to be the most powerful ever erected in the political history of the United States. As the Literary Digest stated, Clements was the "brains" of the movement. The Members of Congress friendly to the McGroarty bill depended on him for accurate information, while Congressmen unfriendly to the McGroarty bill feared him and the organization that he

built. It was Clements who created in the minds of millions of Townsendites throughout the country an idealistic leader in the person of Dr. Townsend. Clements did not have to do that. This plan is as much his as Townsend's, but he preferred to stay in the background and wanted Townsend to have all the glory, all Clements wanted was to have the satisfaction of putting the plan into effect as quickly as possible. Dr. Townsend's vacillating policy of making erroneous statements calling for constant retractions was ever a source of worry and concern. I often wondered how Clements, a man with a definite policy, stood it as long as he did. It would seem to me that in Clements Dr. Townsend had the one man who might successfully carry him through an investigation by the congressional committee in the proper manner. His resignation, forced by Townsend and his new advisors who are apparently seeking Clements' place within the movement, has resulted in Congressmen, who were favorable to our cause, losing faith in the O. A. R. P. while retaining their belief in the McGroarty bill.

Clements' resignation has also resulted in the fact that Congressmen heretofore fearful of the O. A. R. P. now sigh with relief. I know that Clements at this time is as strong as he ever was for the McGroarty bill, but that Dr. Townsend's actions in secretly calling a meeting in California with his brother, Walter Townsend, and the then third member of O. A. R. P., Ltd., and changing the bylaws without the knowledge of Mr. Clements, made it impossible for him to continue with the organization harmoniously. To try and save the solidarity of the movement Clements resigned—he proved that he thought more of the movement than of his own position.

In spite of this he has been bitterly and falsely attacked and maligned; to all of which he has made no reply, all for the sake of harmony in the movement. It naturally followed under the new set-up engineered by those who wanted to take Clements' place in the movement and who had gained the confidence of Townsend, that Clements would be unable to pursue the policies which had heretofore proven so successful. The change effected by Dr. Townsend would make Clements subservient to a board which had had no part in building the organization or shaping its policies, and who, I believe, will prove wholly incapable of managing a movement of such proportions, and a movement which even Dr. Townsend knew little about. I believe the actions of this new board for the past few weeks sustain my belief.

At the time of Clements' resignation, April 1, 1936, there was \$130,000 in the treasury of the O. A. R. P. and no debts. Dr. Townsend testified on May 20, 1936, that there was only about \$60,000 of that amount left. In other words, this "great national board" when once given access to the cash not only spent all receipts taken in during the period but spent over half the total cash reserve within 6 weeks. An examination of the records of the O. A. R. P. will show that the cash reserve constantly increased from the inception of the movement to April 1, 1936, under Mr. Clements' direction. The spending of the money is bad enough within itself, but the condemning charge against this national board and its mismanagement, is that all during this time when over \$100,000 was being spent by them, not a finger was being lifted toward assisting the enactment of our legislation. Not a single member of this new board nor a representative of the O. A. R. P. have made even the slightest effort in this direction. In contrast to this lack of interest, Mr. Clements has constantly worked for the McGroarty bill, even since his resignation, and is still on Capitol hill daily and at his own expense. No better proof of lack of interest in the enactment of our legislation can be given than the removal of the entire national headquarters offices from Washington, D. C., to Chicago. No office whatever of the O. A. R. P. remains in Washington. Do they think the Congressmen and Senators will call Chicago long distance for information? The laws are made in Washington, not in Chicago or California.

In the Townsend Weekly, Townsend says Clements refused to democratize the movement, says Clements wanted

the autocratic power to remain in Townsend and Clements. What better proof of the wisdom of Clements' policy could be given than that he built the greatest organization ever built in the same length of time anywhere? I claim the people are interested in results and not whether the control is vested in two men or one or a "debating society" of seven or eight or nine, and Clements got results. A prominent Congressman favorable to our cause said just last week that he had over 20,000 letters from Townsendites in his files and there was not one word against Clements in all of them.

The new "democratic organization" the good Dr. Townsend has so much to say about is composed of a board of seven men besides Townsend, and six of the seven are on the pay roll of the O. A. R. P., and the seventh is a politician. Certainly Townsend has a "national board" of employees who say "yes" or get "fired."

Regardless of all else, what has Townsend or his "democratic" board done to promote the passage of our bill in this session? The answer, much to their discredit, is "nothing." Internal and external politics of the organization and a frantic and all too successful effort to get themselves comfortably on the pay roll of the movement has consumed their thoughts to the exclusion of what to them must be the "unimportant" matter of getting the Townsend plan enacted into law.

I am happy to see Clements defend the Townsend movement and the McGroarty bill before the investigation committee and Congressmen and the public, even after he is officially out of the movement. Clements is still a staunch friend and defender of the real Townsend plan.

Not to have continued the fight being carried on by Clements on the outside and myself on the inside of Congress was a definite retreat. There were held two meetings of Congressmen, one attended by 31 and the other attended by 37 Congressmen and several outsiders and congressional secretaries, at which the tax features of the McGroarty bill were discussed, and the old friends of the bill were strengthened with undisputable arguments, and new friends among the Congressmen made. A continuation of these meetings was planned as long as new Congressmen would attend and listen to Clements explain the simplicity and workability of the transactions tax. I also accompanied Clements on one of his several meetings with important Senators. He had arranged for a senatorial sponsor for our bill in the Senate. Since April 1, when Clements resigned, I have not been contacted, nor have I been able to find a single Congressman who has been called upon by Dr. Townsend or any member of the national board. All work for the passage of our bill has been abandoned by the present officials of the O. A. R. P., but they still frantically appeal for more money to pay increased salaries and hold board meetings and buy radio time to elect themselves to public office.

The forcing of the Frazier-Lemke bill out of committee in spite of terrific opposition only again proves the contention that by constant cooperative action we had a chance to bring the McGroarty bill to a vote in this session. Certainly the McGroarty bill with the united backing of the vast organization of the Townsend movement had a much more logical chance to be forced to the floor for open debate than the Frazier-Lemke bill.

This session our failure has come from within and not from without our own organization.

And now, in conclusion, let me again refer to the investigation by a congressional committee of the leadership of the Townsend movement. I feel that regardless of the findings of the committee with respect to the leaders of the Townsend movement, the clubs already formed should remain intact. They should work with their own officers and the other clubs in their congressional district to elect Congressmen favorable to the McGroarty bill.

Incumbent Congressmen who supported our legislation must be returned to Congress. Not to do so would be notice to all Members of Congress that we would double-cross our friends. We would lose standing by such a grave breach of confidence. This point I have emphasized in every way

possible since I first introduced the bill. The future success of the McGroarty bill will be governed by the efforts of the workers in the field from now until November 1936. We must have in the Seventy-fifth Congress sufficient Congressmen and Senators to pass the McGroarty bill.

I am devoted to the cause of pensions for the aged citizens of our country. It is a holy cause which all God-fearing, just men may well espouse. I predict its ultimate enactment into the law of our beloved country.

AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is a noteworthy example of progress in our economic life that cash receipts from the sale of principal farm products in South Dakota increased from \$56,654,000 in 1932 to \$94,835,000 in 1935—almost double. This includes \$17,299,000 in rental and benefit payments. In terms of percentage, the increase was 67 percent. Approximately 97 percent of the total farm cash income from production is represented by these cash receipts.

On August 15, 1932, South Dakota farmers were receiving 33 cents for wheat, while on December 15, 1935, they were getting 89 cents a bushel.

Corn in the same period rose from 23 cents to 44 cents. Oats went from 9 to 19 cents. Barley, rye, buckwheat, flaxseed, potatoes, hay, and apples climbed perceptibly.

Hogs, which sold for \$3.60 per hundredweight over 3 years ago, are now selling for \$8.20.

I could quote at length figures referring to beef cattle, veal calves, milk cows, chickens, butter, eggs, and wool. The ratio of increase varies, but it is definite in all cases.

In the country as a whole the yearly average price of all groups of farm products increased from 65 to 108 percent of the pre-war level during the 1932-35 period—a gain of 66 percent.

A new appreciation of farm real estate in South Dakota is another result of increased farm income. Farm labor conditions have also improved materially. On January 1, 1933, the demand for farm labor in South Dakota was 56 percent below normal and the supply was 27 percent above normal. At the same time the average farm wage rate per person with board was \$11.75 per month. Three years later, on January 1, 1936, the farm labor supply was 5 percent below normal. Demand was 39 percent below normal. The average farm wage rate with board stood at \$16 per month, having advanced 56 percent above its 1933 level.

Agricultural adjustment is one of the genuine accomplishments of the Roosevelt administration. What the farmers of my State think of it can be realized from the vote in the Nation-wide wheat referendum May 25, 1935. In South Dakota 24,489 farmers out of 28,201—about 87 percent—cast their ballots in favor of a wheat-adjustment program to succeed that in force.

These are some of the signs of the times. They indicate that we are going steadily forward in national recovery.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, several requests have been made by Members on this side of the aisle for permission to address the House, and objection has been made. Today there were three special addresses made by Members on the other side of the aisle. I dislike to object to the gentleman's request, but under the circumstances, for the present, I shall have to object.

AMENDMENT OF COASTWISE LOAD LINE ACT

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11915) to amend the Coastwise Load Line Act, 1935, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BLAND, SIROVICH, RAMSPECK, LEHLBACH, and WELCH.

THE HIDDEN PURPOSE OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN BILL—(WHICH EXPLAINS WHY THE WHOLESALERS WHO WROTE THE BILL IN ITS ORIGINAL FORM HAVE FOUGHT SO DESPERATELY FOR IT)—SOMETHING FOR THE CONFEREES TO CONSIDER

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Balfour declaration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the real but hidden purpose of this bill is virtually to eliminate quantity discounts—that is, the economies of mass buying—thereby forcing mass buyers, such as chain stores, mail-order houses, farmers, and consumers' cooperatives, to pay more, and thus charge their customers more. This would naturally give the wholesaler who sells to small retailers a wider margin and would tend to force trade through the traditional wholesaler-retailer channels. If the large buyer could get little or no advantage in buying direct from the manufacturer, he would soon go back to the wholesaler.

The language of the House and Senate bills which covers this vital matter of allowable quantity discounts—section 2 (a), subsection 1—seems very innocent. It seems to provide that price differentials are allowable as between customers where they "make only due allowance for differences in cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered."

Even when this language is taken at what appears to be face value, it unduly restricts competing manufacturers whose costs of either manufacture, sale, or delivery may differ. That is, a manufacturer whose production cost may be high and whose distribution cost may be low might find himself unduly limited in trying to compete for the business of a large-scale buyer, since the allowable difference in price which he could quote would be restricted to the savings effected on his already low distributive cost.

But aside from this, the peculiar language which distinguishes this paragraph from the somewhat similar paragraph now found in the Clayton Act seems to have an extraordinary significance. This language has been insisted upon by the proponents of the bill and has been restored in the present form of the bill before us, although it was eliminated in an earlier version hereof.

Mr. H. B. Teegarden, attorney for the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, who is the admitted author of the original Robinson-Patman bill, gave his explanation of what this peculiar language meant on pages 30-31 of the hearings, as follows:

For illustration: Suppose manufacturer A maintains a system of branch sales offices and a corps of traveling salesmen for the purpose of canvassing and selling to the wholesale trade, and that the costs of this sales organization, including its overhead, represents 25 percent of his gross sales. Suppose, then, that chain X comes to A's headquarters office and offers him a large order for delivery direct to his chain retail outlets throughout the coming year and demands on that order a 25-percent discount on the plea that it has not required the services of A's selling organization in any respect. If the same additional quantity of business had been sold to A's wholesale customers, it would have cost him, say, 3 percent more for salesmen's traveling expenses and perhaps salaries of some additional salesmen, but otherwise would have been absorbed under his existing sales overhead.

In such case the chain might be given the 3-percent discount, but not a 25-percent discount. The manufacturer is not able to abandon his whole selling organization merely by reason of the order of this chain, nor is he able to reduce his costs to an amount representing 25 percent of this chain's order. He does save 3 percent, however, as compared with the same amount of business sold to his other customers, and that 3 percent, therefore, represents the difference in cost of sale "resulting from the differing methods . . . in which such commodities are as to such purchasers (namely, the chains and the independents) sold or delivered."

It is evident from the above that the intent of this language is to restrict tremendously the discounts allowable to the mass buyer and greatly to increase the price which must

be charged the mass buyer in order to avoid a violation of this section.

Senator LOGAN, in his committee report on the Robinson bill, gives approximately the same interpretation of this language, though less clearly. This interpretation is found at the bottom of page 5 and top of page 6 of the Senate committee report. Senator LOGAN attempts to summarize this point in the following language:

It is designed, in short, to leave the test of a permissible differential upon the question: If the more favored customer were sold in the same quantities and by the same methods of sale and delivery as the customer not so favored, how much more per unit would it actually cost the seller to do so, his other business remaining the same?

The evident intent, as set forth by Senator LOGAN, is to force the mass buyer to pay for wholesaling, advertising, and other facilities and functions, even though he does not use them. It is easily apparent that under these circumstances the present wholesale-retail system would be legislated into a preferred position, since there would be little incentive for a manufacturer to seek more efficient distribution methods. This is, of course, exactly what the real backers of this legislation seek to accomplish.

Next came the House committee report, which, while clearly differing from the interpretations above quoted, still carried something of the same idea of forcing the mass buyer to pay for facilities and services which he does not utilize. The committee report says—page 10—concerning this language in this bill:

This in its plain meaning permits differences in overhead where they can actually be shown as between the customers or classes of customers concerned, but it precludes differentials based on the imputation of overhead to particular customers, or the exemption of others from it, where such overhead represents facilities or activities inseparable from the seller's business as a whole and not attributable to the business of particular customers or of the particular customers concerned in the discrimination.

This might be considered by the Federal Trade Commission as authorizing them to require a manufacturer to charge to the mass buyer a proportionate share of the general sales or advertising expense of the manufacturer, even though the mass buyer did not use or receive any benefit therefrom and did, in fact, pay for his own advertising, as was the case in the pending Goodyear-Sears, Roebuck tire case.

If this is the meaning to be read into this language, it would be a severe blow to the development of more efficient methods of merchandising and is directly contradictory to the stated purposes of the bill.

Both in the Senate and later in the House, Members have asked questions in an effort to find out what limitations are put on quantity discounts under the terms of the Robinson-Patman bills and never once has there been a direct and unequivocal answer.

Usually the question has been, "Would manufacturers have to charge buyers the same prices for large orders as for small orders?" Or, "Is there provision in the bill for allowing lower prices on big purchases than on small purchases?" The answer has always been, "Yes." This is correct as far as it goes; there would be small allowable differences in price. But it does not answer the real question the inquirers had in mind. They want to know whether the full savings and economies of mass buying—either by cooperatives or chains and in cases where no quantity limit has been set by the Federal Trade Commission—could be allowed by the manufacturer to the mass buyer so that the latter could, in turn, pass it on to the consumer; and that question has never been answered.

This question was propounded in the House debate on May 28 by Mr. CELLER, who read a letter from Chester Gray, Washington representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation, dated May 26. Mr. Gray, after pointing out that they were puzzled by the interpretation of the Judiciary Committee reports given to the language of section 2 (a), subsection (2), in the House bill, wrote:

We would like to have you ask those in charge of this bill to state whether this language would permit the full economies of mass buying to be passed on to the buyer or whether such a buyer would be required to pay for facilities which he does not utilize, such as

a pro-rata share of salesmen's expenses, advertising, warehousing, etc.?

If you do not get a satisfactory answer, we would urge you to insist upon changes in the language so as to allow all of the economies of mass cooperative buying to be passed on to the buyers.

Mr. CELLER read this letter and propounded this question. Mr. PATMAN, the chief sponsor of the bill in the House, first evaded a reply by talking about "monopoly" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8450), and when Mr. CELLER protested that this was not an answer, and his time expired, Mr. MILLER—who was in charge of the bill—made no attempt to reply and forced an immediate vote on the pending amendment.

When cornered on this question in a public debate in New York Senator LOGAN finally admitted that the effect of this language as interpreted by the committees would be to force nearly the same price to chain stores as to small retailers; in other words, that there would be virtually no quantity discount. Senator LOGAN agreed at that time to endeavor to modify the language in this section.

No doubt this virtual elimination of quantity-purchase savings (discounts) was what Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN had in mind when he told groups of grocers and druggists all over the country that when this bill becomes a law the small merchant can buy his goods at the same price the large chain now buys. Mr. PATMAN also made this statement several times in printed speeches and on the floor of the House. On March 9, for instance, Mr. PATMAN said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3573):

In truth and in fact, if the Robinson-Patman bill is enacted into law, all merchants will receive the same prices from the manufacturers that the chain stores now receive.

When questioned about this statement by Mr. CELLER during the debate on this bill on May 27, Mr. PATMAN claimed that his statement meant "for same quantities or under same conditions." But Mr. PATMAN's statement on the floor of the House and his speeches to dealers made no such reference. In fact, some of his statements emphasize the idea that the smallest merchant will receive the same—or nearly the same—price as the large chains.

So this vital part of the bill, and its committee interpretations, which would have standing in the courts in case of litigation, comes to final conference under a false impression if not actual misrepresentation.

Not over 5 percent of the Members of Congress realize how far reaching this bill would be, how it affects every line of business that does buying and selling, including the seller of raw materials to the manufacturer and the retail sales of the small retailer who may be located near a State line or otherwise involved in interstate commerce. Many feel certain that it will increase the cost of living but are not well enough informed on the bill to answer the assertions of the advocate who undertakes to claim that it will not increase living costs.

The Borah-Van Nuys bill has the decided advantage that it would prevent actual discriminations—either of the unfair advertising or brokerage allowance type or the unearned quantity discount—yet it would not upset legitimate and efficient business methods nor legislate a subsidy for any particular class of middlemen. Unless the Borah-Van Nuys bill can be adopted this whole matter should go over to the next Congress for more careful study.

LIBERALIZING FARM MORTGAGE LOANS

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, on the 26th of May I introduced H. R. 12853, providing for the liberalization of farm-loan mortgages, to include a class of farmers now threatened with mortgage foreclosures, who are unable to qualify for loans under the existing farm credit system.

The farmer now threatened with foreclosure and the loss of his home may not have security to qualify under the appraised value his land and improvements will justify for a long-time loan. But his security, with a reasonable faith in

returning farm values, may be ample for a short-time loan. Then, within the loan period, through improved price levels, he will be able to refinance his loan, or pay it off.

This bill is intended to cover that situation.

PROVISIONS OF H. R. 12853

Under provisions of this bill a first-lien loan may be made by the land bank commissioner for not more than 4 years at not exceeding 5-percent interest for 85 percent of the appraised normal value of the land, including permanent improvements. It is provided that no loan shall exceed \$50,000. No loan shall be made unless, in the judgment of the commissioner, payment thereof, as agreed, is reasonably assured.

In determining the probability of repayment, the commissioner shall consider the probability of better farm prices with improved economic conditions, whether or not the property is prudently managed, and all other factors reasonably indicating its future value.

Such loans shall be limited to refinancing a farm indebtedness or the repurchase of a farm after foreclosure.

The authority to make these emergency loans will expire June 30, 1938.

SHORT-TIME LOANS FOR EMERGENCY

The additional class of farmers who could receive the benefit of these loans includes those who have suffered foreclosures, or who are now unable to qualify under the present loan provisions of the Federal farm-loan system. The farmers who should be especially benefited are those whose loan values are depressed because of abnormally low farm prices, or whose farm improvements are not of adequate security value for long-time loans, but of much higher value for short loans.

The original theory of the Federal farm-loan system was to provide the farmer with long-term loans at moderate interest rates. There was no purpose to subsidize farm loans at the expense of the public, either by accepting inadequate security or insufficient interest. The plan was intended to be self-liquidating, and intended to save the farmer from extortionate interest charges.

That policy was sound. To be permanently successful and afford the farmer long-time loans, at low interest, the loans must be supported by adequate security, appraised on the safe side of fluctuating values, and with full recognition of the depreciation to which land improvements are subject. Therefore, the long-loan plan, if on a sound basis, means relatively low land loans and still lower loans on improvements.

The imprudence of overindebtedness by a farmer or other debtor supports the wisdom of moderate loan values for a long-time farm-loan system.

FLUCTUATING VALUES

However, we now face a situation which has necessarily modified this conservative policy, especially as to refinancing existing farm mortgages. The present situation calls for a short-time loan with the higher loan value of short-time security to meet an old indebtedness. Within the last 16 years the index figures for farm-land values, as an average, has swung up and down from 73 to 170. Inevitably, loan values at the peak, and even at normal values, have become inadequate at depression levels.

In the depth of the depression we had an appalling record of farm foreclosures. The same psychology that made runs on banks created mortgage foreclosures. In some cases cupidity and avarice also conspired to take advantage of the debtor's misfortune, due to no act of his own. The Government has done much in providing the funds and liberalizing our farm credit system to combat and alleviate the evils of this situation.

PREVENT FORECLOSURES AT DEPRESSION VALUES

There are still farms threatened with foreclosure that cannot meet the present requirements of the Farm Credit Administration and which the Government might prudently save from foreclosure and keep the farmer and his family in their old home, and in some cases restore to them the home already lost.

Foreclosure and ejectment against a worthy farmer and his family is a tragedy. To save or prevent that tragedy is a most worthy form of relief.

The farmer's hope, the country's hope, is not in depression levels but in our confidence of a better day to come. It is not necessary for the Government, in order to do its duty, to subsidize the farmer's debt. That would be a burden beyond public duty. We can still do much in this situation, and prudently, by giving loan margins partly on a reasonable expectation of recovery values.

This bill, if justly and prudently administered, would authorize the refinancing of farm mortgages in every case where that could be done with due regard to public responsibility in the matter. It would not subsidize farm loans. It would not invite in any farmers who were not in need of such loans, or whose farms are already fairly financed.

This bill is introduced in the belief that there are still large numbers of farm mortgages that could be refinanced on a sound basis without undue hazard to the Government on the short-term basis proposed. That would carry the farmer over until advancing recovery conditions would make him able to refinance or pay off his debt, and thus save his farm.

I urge its favorable consideration by Congress at the earliest practicable date.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, from day to day the House and Senate are being regaled by charges that W. P. A. funds are being spent for political purposes with a view of winning for the Democrats the coming election. Strange as it may seem, nearly all these charges are made by members of the Democratic Party. Resolutions of investigation have been introduced, but up to this time the overwhelming Democratic majority in each branch of Congress has been able to keep such resolutions in Committee.

In addition to the politics in the selection of workers on the W. P. A. "works" projects in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Missouri, and many other States, (and by this I mean using W. P. A. jobs to coerce the people on relief into voting the Democratic ticket) many other things are happening in connection with the activities under Mr. Hopkins, the chief of the W. P. A., which will not bear the light of day. I ask my readers to bear these statements in mind in the near future when conditions in Michigan will receive an airing.

Conditions in Pennsylvania, where according to official records, the Administration has spent or has allocated to be spent, more than \$500,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, seem to be about as bad as they can be. Some idea of the foolish and inexcusable ways in which this money is being dissipated can be had from a news release from the Works Progress Administration at Harrisburg, Pa., which reads in part as follows:

HARRISBURG, PA., May 14, 1936.—One of the most unusual undertakings of the Works Progress Administration in the State is a project providing beauty treatments for women who are mentally ill.

Scores of patients in the Allentown State Hospital have received facials, hair waves, and manicures from W. P. A. beauticians drafted from the ranks of the unemployed.

Similar treatments will soon be available to women patients in the Philadelphia General Hospital and the Torrance State Hospital.

One of the supervisors of the work (who, of course, is one of the W. P. A. higher-paid agents) declared: "Doctors have told us that the change brought about in patients by the beauty treatments have been remarkable. They have found that the women become much brighter in spirits, easier to handle, and infinitely more concerned with their dress and personal appearance."

The work is under the direction of the women's and professional projects of the W. P. A., which supervises employment for women and for men schooled in professions, arts, letters, and various skilled services.

I think everyone familiar with these activities will agree that this does constitute "a most unusual undertaking."

The same news release, referring to another W. P. A. project, called attention to 17,680 persons, nearly all of

whom are women, who are engaged in producing clothing and bedding for the poor, and inmates of State institutions. This is unquestionably a proper and justified undertaking.

The release goes on to explain that a W. P. A. exhibit would be held in Philadelphia and says:

There will be vaudeville acts by W. P. A. entertainers, art galleries showing the canvases of W. P. A. painters, sculpturing, concerts by a W. P. A. band and a W. P. A. orchestra, and a sewing exhibit.

From time to time we have learned of the spending of immense sums in teaching esthetic dancing to women in the cities, grand opera to the mountaineers in the Ozarks, and more than \$60,000,000 for "recreation", but the prize crackpot scheme for wasting the public moneys seems to be incorporated in a news report from Nashville, Tenn., appearing in the Nashville Banner, a well-known and responsible newspaper of the South, which stated:

Despite the inclement weather, three tables of contract bridge were played in parlors of the Hotel Montgomery Tuesday night, sponsored by the W. P. A. recreational committee. * * * It is the plan of the committee to provide recreation and a wholesome manner of passing away leisure time for adults as well as children.

The tragedy of the situation is disclosed by the rapidly growing national debt. The latest information from the Treasury is to the effect that by July 1, it will have become \$36,000,000,000, which is fifteen billions greater than it was at the beginning of the present Roosevelt administration 3½ years ago.

In pondering the general situation it ought not for a moment to be forgotten that not only must the people generally pay for all these boondoggling activities mentioned above, but the so-called gifts handed out to the various communities by the agents of the Federal Government are not gifts by any manner of means. All this money comes from borrowing on the credit of the American people. They will have to pay it back, every nickel of it.

With this in mind it must be apparent that wise care should be exercised in selecting projects and activities upon which to spend this money. Not 1 penny of it should be spent for purposes not useful and that will not be of some benefit to those who come after us, and who must pay in large part for it all.

Not less than 20 cents out of every dollar the farmer and the workingman have to spend goes to pay taxes. They may not realize it, but when they buy something from a store they are paying the tax of the storekeeper, the tax of the manufacturer who produces the finished article, and the tax of everyone who produces anything which goes into the finished article. The consumer pays it all. The only person who pays no tax is the individual who has no money to spend. Every other person is directly and vitally interested in this rapidly growing national debt and its accompanying rapidly increasing tax burdens.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Townsend made a serious mistake when he ordered his associates to ignore the Bell investigating committee. I doubt whether the House would have voted to cite the doctor for contempt if he had refrained from public comment after he made his dramatic exit from the committee hearings. I must add that the reported merger of Townsend forces with Huey Long share-the-wealth clubs does not click, so far as I am concerned. I resent the conduct of certain individuals, unknown to me, who presumed to issue a statement in my name concerning a supposed communistic pattern in the management of the Townsend investigating committee and the Huey Long assassination. I had no reason to make, and did not make, any such comment.

I have participated in the work of a steering committee of Congress in an attempt to clarify and perfect certain features of the McGroarty bill. But I have never been consulted

regarding the management or plans of the Townsend organization in Washington. I have seen with regret some evidences of friction between Dr. Townsend and Representative McGROARTY. I have always believed that Dr. McGROARTY is a sincere believer in the principle of a just and generous pension for our deserving elderly citizens.

I stand by the principle of the McGroarty bill, H. R. 7154. In the absence of a constitutional amendment, practically all sales of commodities for personal consumption, as well as all other intrastate sales, would be exempted from the tax. The proposed 2-percent transactions tax in its broadest aspects may be a mild form of capital levy, but this does not mean that I subscribe to a radical share-the-wealth plank. Every owner of farm and residential property during the past 5 years has been subjected to a capital levy. But that was a necessary incident of the depression. Real-estate taxes have been confiscatory to a degree, and our elderly people have been among the chief sufferers. It is only an act of economic justice to give these people the benefit of another form of tax that will help to compensate them for the privations and losses that have been visited upon them through no fault of their own, and at a time in life when they cannot rehabilitate their own fortunes. The principle of just and generous pensions for deserving elderly people is bigger than any individual or any organization. And that principle will grow in wisdom and stature in the contemplation of the American people, regardless of the acts of omission or commission that may be credited to or charged against Dr. Townsend and his associates.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be granted leave of absence for 1 day on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SHANLEY (at the request of Mr. KOPPLEMANN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. COFFEE, for 1 week, on account of important business in Nebraska.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 4037. An act to amend the act relating to the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, approved June 10, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 267. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by means of catastrophes of nature.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 11418. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12027. An act to authorize the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Thomas Jefferson.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 3, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will meet Wednesday, June 3, 1936, at 10:30 a. m., to consider private bills; also on June 4, 1936, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 1293.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. CULLEN: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 11767. A bill to provide for the entry under bond of exhibits of arts, sciences, and industries, and products of the soil, mine, and sea, and all other exhibits for exposition purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 566. A joint resolution providing for the contribution by the United States to the expense of the tercentenary celebration by the State of Rhode Island; without amendment (Rept. 2910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CASTELLOW: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 235. A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to expend funds of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for participation by the United States in the 1936 Sixth World's Poultry Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURNHAM: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 12328. A bill to authorize the acceptance of certain lands in the city of San Diego, Calif., by the United States, and the transfer by the Secretary of the Navy of certain other lands to said city of San Diego; without amendment (Rept. No. 2912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12898. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Mackinac Straits Bridge Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan; with amendment (Rept. No. 2913). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EICHER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4461. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Brownville, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2914). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EICHER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4462. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the towns of Decatur, Nebr., and Onawa, Iowa; with amendment (Rept. No. 2915). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EICHER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4463. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the cities of South Sioux City, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 2916). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MALONEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4618. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free or toll highway bridge, or a railway bridge in combination with a free or toll highway bridge, and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2917). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SADOWSKI: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12843. A bill authorizing the State of Wisconsin to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near La Crosse, La Crosse County, Wis.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2920). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CORNING: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12850. A bill authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the West Branch of the Delaware River between a point in the vicinity of the village of Hancock, Delaware County, N. Y., and a point in the town of Buckingham, Wayne County, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2921). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CORNING: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12851. A bill authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Delaware River between points in the village of Barryville, Sullivan County, N. Y., and the village of Shohola, Pike County, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2922). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KENNEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1645. An act to provide for the creation of a commission to examine into and report the clear height above the water of the bridge authorized to be constructed over the Hudson River from Fifty-seventh Street, New York, to New Jersey, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. GREENWAY: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 11182. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHANDLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3841. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; with amendment (Rept. No. 2926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUTRICH: A bill (H. R. 12940) to provide for the filing of a second suit in certain cases against the United States where the first one has been or shall be dismissed because it was started by the issuance of a summons instead of by verified petition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12941) authorizing the Pennsylvania Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near Millersburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 12942) to provide a graduated scale of reduction of payments under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12943) to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of resettlement or rural-rehabilitation projects; to authorize payments to States, political subdivisions, and local taxing units in lieu of taxes on such premises; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHELCHER: A bill (H. R. 12944) authorizing the erection of a Confederate monument by the United Daughters of the Confederacy of Commerce, Ga., on the post-office site at Commerce, Ga.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LEMKE: A bill (H. R. 12945) to liquidate and re-finance existing mortgages on homes in cities and towns at a reduced rate of interest by establishing an efficient credit system through the use of the Home Owners' Loan Corpora-

tion and the Federal Reserve Banking System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. NORTON: Resolution (H. Res. 537) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia appointed to make a study of traffic conditions; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: Resolution (H. Res. 538) pertaining to motions to suspend the rules; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Resolution (H. Res. 539) providing for the appointment of managers on the part of the House with the authority to agree or disagree to all amendments except Senate amendments 41 and 49 to H. R. 12624; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NORTON (by request): A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 616) to ratify and confirm the appointment of Isaac Gans as a member of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 617) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to regulate hours and conditions of labor and to establish minimum wages in any employment, and to regulate production, industry, business, trade, and commerce to prevent unfair methods and practices therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 618) to amend the Constitution empowering each State to fix minimum rates of wages of women and minors employed in industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 12946) for the relief of Virgil H. Heise; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGROARTY: A bill (H. R. 12947) for the relief of First Lt. Roy E. Rountree; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY: A bill (H. R. 12948) for the relief of Robert J. White; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TOLAN: A bill (H. R. 12949) extending the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act to Joseph Henry Jackson; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

11032. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of the Detroit Board of Commerce, registering protest against the Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

11033. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Water Conservation League of Manatee County, Fla.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

11034. Also, petition of the Manatee County (Fla.) Growers' Association; to the committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1936

(Legislative day of Monday, June 1, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 2, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.